arXiv:1405.5908v3 [math.OC] 11 Jun 2015

Locally Sparse Reconstruction Using the $\ell^{1,\infty}$-Norm

Pia Heins* Michael Moeller† Martin Burger*

June 12, 2015

Abstract

This paper discusses the incorporation of local sparsity information, e.g. in each pixel of an image, via minimization of the $\ell^{1,\infty}$-norm. We discuss the basic properties of this norm when used as a regularization functional and associated optimization problems, for which we derive equivalent reformulations either more amenable to theory or to numerical computation. Further focus of the analysis is put on the locally 1-sparse case, which is well motivated by some biomedical imaging applications.

Our computational approaches are based on alternating direction methods of multipliers (ADMM) and appropriate splittings with augmented Lagrangians. Those are tested for a model scenario related to dynamic positron emission tomography (PET), which is a functional imaging technique in nuclear medicine.

The results of this paper provide insight into the potential impact of regularization with the $\ell^{1,\infty}$-norm for local sparsity in appropriate settings. However, it also indicates several shortcomings, possibly related to the non-tightness of the functional as a relaxation of the $\ell^{0,\infty}$-norm.

1 Introduction

Sparse reconstructions based on minimizing ℓ^1-norms have gained huge attention in signal and image processing, inverse problems, and compressed sensing recently. Their main feature of delivering sparse reconstructions, in some cases provably the same as with minimizing the nonconvex ℓ^0-functional (cf. [14, 11, 9, 51, 36]), is attractive for many applications and has led to remarkable development in theory and numerics. However, the overall sparsity enforced by minimal ℓ^1-norm is not the only kind of prior information available in practice. Strong recent directions of research are related to unknowns being matrices, with prior information being e.g. low rank incorporated via nuclear norm minimization or block sparsity (or collaborative sparsity) incorporated by minimization of $\ell^{p,1}$-norms with $p \in (1, \infty)$. Such regularizations have been studied for instance by Fornasier and Rauhut [21] and Teschke and Ramlau [47] under the name of *joint sparsity*. Furthermore, details as well as applications of such types of joint sparsity priors can for instance be found in [1, 2, 3]. Note that there exist several different definitions of mixed $\ell^{p,q}$-norms in the literature (cf. for instance [37, 52]). We act in accordance with the definition of mixed norms as proposed in [37, Definition 1]. We refer the reader to [37, 57] and the references therein for more details on mixed matrix norms. As a

*Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster, Institut für Numerische und Angewandte Mathematik, Einsteinstrasse 62, D 48149 Münster, Germany (pia.heins@wwu.de, martin.burger@wwu.de)

†Technische Universität München, Department of Computer Science, Informatik 9, Boltzmannstrasse 3, D 85748 Garching, Germany (m.moeller@gmx.net)

special type of mixed norms we discuss the following type of sparsity-functional for matrices, namely the $\ell^{1,\infty}$-norm

$$\|U\|_{1,\infty} = \max_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} |u_{ij}|, \tag{1}$$

where $U \in \mathbb{R}^{M\times N}$. Our motivation is a *local sparsity* that frequently appears in inversion with some spatial dimensions (related to the index i) and at least one additional dimension such as time or spectral information in imaging (related to the index j). The main ingredients in the reconstruction problems we want to consider are a dictionary $B \in \mathbb{R}^{T\times N}$ (encoding basis elements), with N basis vectors, T e.g. time steps and $N > T$, a forward operator $A \in \mathbb{R}^{L\times M}$, with M pixels, L depending on the application (typically $L < M$ being a number of detectors), and the measured data $W \in \mathbb{R}^{L\times T}$, which yield an inverse problem of the form

$$AUB^T = W. \tag{2}$$

The unknown matrix $U \in \mathbb{R}^{M\times N}$ is the collection of the coefficients with respect to the basis or dictionary encoded in B. Frequently a good dictionary for the local behaviour in the additional dimension can be found such that the vector $u_{i\bullet}$ is expected to be sparse, which means we want to minimize

$$\|U\|_{0,\infty} = \max_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}} \|u_{i\bullet}\|_0$$

with $0^0 := 0$ subject to (2). A natural relaxation is to consider the minimization of (1) subject to (2) instead.
Examples of applications with such kind of information are:

- *Dynamic Positron Emission Tomograpy* (PET, and similar problems in SPECT, cf. [58, 41, 31, 30]), where i refers to the pixel number of the image to be reconstructed and B is a local dictionary of (discretized) time-basis functions. The operator A is the PET matrix (roughly a sampled Radon-transforms with some corrections) and the basis functions are generated by kinetic modeling, i.e. as solutions of simple linear ODE systems with unknown parameters. The dictionary is generated indirectly by a dictionary for the parameters in the ODE. Clearly one often looks for a unique parameter value, i.e. a representation by only one basis function in each pixel, an ultimate kind of sparsity.

- *Fluorescence-lifetime imaging microscopy* (FLIM, cf. [18, 38]) where A is a convolution in space or the identity and B contains different functions, which characterize the photon decay and are also convolved in time. Considering different basis functions for different fluorophores local sparsity may enhance the unmixing process.

- *ECG Cardiac Activation Time Reconstruction* (cf. [43, 35], where i refers to a grid point on the epicardial surface and B is a dictionary of step functions parametrized by the activation time. Again one looks for a single activation time in each grid point, i.e. an ultimately sparse local representation usually not formulated this way.

- *Spectral- and Hyperspectral Imaging* (cf. [4, 20]), where the operator A is often a convolution and B is a dictionary of spectral signatures of expected elements. Currently resolution is hardly small enough that pixels resolve pure materials, but one may easily assume that only very few materials are contained in each pixel, which corresponds also to the above local sparsity prior.

Our analysis below will demonstrate that it may be advantageous to consider a combination of minimizing (1) with classical ℓ^1-sparsity. We will therefore also investigate the more general problem

$$\min_{U\in\mathbb{R}^{M\times N}} \alpha\|U\|_{1,\infty} + \beta\|U\|_{1,1} \quad \text{s.t.} \quad AUB^T = W \ . \tag{3}$$

Besides the constrained model (3) we shall also investigate the unconstrained model

$$\min_{U\in\mathbb{R}^{M\times N}} \frac{1}{2}\|\gamma(AUB^T - W)\|_F^2 + \alpha\|U\|_{1,\infty} + \beta\|U\|_{1,1} \ , \tag{4}$$

which is suited to deal with noisy data. Here we use the Frobenius norm for the first part. Moreover, $\gamma^T\gamma$ shall be a positive definite weighting matrix (in a statistical formulation the inverse covariance matrix of the noise). Since in basically all practical applications one only looks for positive combinations of basis elements, we shall put a particular emphasis on the case of an *additional nonnegativity constraint* on U in (3), respectively (4).

We will investigate some basic properties of the model as well as reformulations with additional inequality constraints. This will make the problem more easily accessible to detailed analysis and numerical methods. Based on the latter we also investigate the potential to exactly reconstruct locally 1-sparse signals by convex optimization techniques. Before going into the details, we therefore state the following fundamental definition:

Definition 1 (s-Sparsity)**.**
A signal z is called s-sparse *if it holds*

$$\|z\|_0 = s \ .$$

1.1 Contributions

Instead of considering usual sparsity regularizations componentwise on the unknown matrix such as minimizing the $\ell^{1,1}$-norm, Yuan and Lin [59] considered for instance a generalization of the lasso method (cf. [48]), which they call *group lasso*. The original lasso method (cf. also the review [49]) is a shrinkage and selection method for linear regression, i.e. it basically minimizes the sum of a squared ℓ^2 data term and an ℓ^1-regularization term. The group lasso, however, generalizes this method by using a slightly different regularization term, i.e. it minimizes the ℓ^1-norm of a weighted ℓ^2-norm. Other group lasso generalizations consider the minimization of the ℓ^1-norm of the ℓ^∞-norm, i.e. the $\ell^{\infty,1}$-regularization, cf. [55, 39, 45]. Later the $\ell^{2,1}$-regularization was further generalized by Fornasier and Rauhut [21] and Teschke and Ramlau [47], which then became known under the term *joint sparsity*. This method mainly consists of minimizing $\ell^{p,1}$-norms, which are used to include even more prior knowledge about the unknown such as additional structures like block sparsity (or collaborative sparsity).

However, for many applications, such as dynamic positron emission tomography or unmixing problems, it turns out to be useful to incorporate another type of sparsity. Enhancing the idea of usual ℓ^1-sparsity to what we call *local sparsity* is one of the main contributions of this paper. Local sparsity turns out to be beneficial when working on problems including inversion with some spatial dimensions and at least one additional dimension such as time or spectral information.

In order to incorporate the idea of local sparsity, we motivate the use of the $\ell^{1,\infty}$-norm as regularization functional in a variational framework for dictionary based reconstruction of matrix completion problems. Working with the $\ell^{1,\infty}$-norm turns out to be rather difficult, which is why we additionally propose alternative formulations of the problem. Besides this, we discuss basic properties of the $\ell^{1,\infty}$-functional and potential exact recovery. In addition, we

propose a splitting algorithm based on alternating direction method of multipliers (ADMM) [28, 27] for the solution of $\ell^{1,\infty}$-regularized problems and show computational results for synthetic examples.

1.2 Organization of this Work

This paper is organized as follows:

In Section 2 we will provide the fundamentals for our method. We will discuss basic properties of the local sparsity promoting $\ell^{1,\infty}$-regularization such as different problem formulations, existence and uniqueness. Moreover, we will give attention to subdifferentials and source conditions for these different formulations. After showing the equivalence of those formulations, we will analyze the asymptotics in case that the regularization parameter tends to infinity.

Section 3 shall be devoted to the analysis of exact recovery of locally 1-sparse solutions, where we will introduce certain conditions for exact recovery.

In Section 4 we will propose an algorithm for the reconstruction with local sparsity, which is based upon the alternating direction method of multipliers (ADMM) [28, 27]. Computational experiments using this algorithm can be found later on in Section 5.

On the basis of the previous sections, we will apply our model to dynamic positron emission tomography, which will be used to visualize myocardial perfusion, in Section 5. We will firstly give a short introduction to the medical and technical background of dynamic positron emission tomography, before we will briefly discuss a model for blood flow and tracer exchange, i.e. kinetic modeling. This will yield the same inverse problem, which we aspire to solve in this paper. Afterwards, we will apply the algorithm, which will be deduced in Section 4, to artificial data in order to verify our model and illustrate its potential.

2 Basic Properties and Formulations

In this section we are going to introduce some equivalent formulations of the main problems (3) and (4), which we use for the analysis later on. Additionally, we point out some basic properties like convexity, existence and potential uniqueness. Furthermore, we propose the subdifferential and discuss a source condition. Moreover, we prove the equivalence of another reformulation, which improves the accessibility of the problem for numerical computation. Finally, we investigate the limit for $\alpha \to \infty$ and observe what happens to the optimal solution in that case.

2.1 Problem Formulations

Since in most applications a nonnegativity constraint is reasonable, we firstly restrict (3) and (4) to this case. For the sake of simplicity, we define

$$G := \left\{ U \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N} \mid u_{ij} \geq 0 \quad \forall\, i \in \{1, \dots M\}\,,\ j \in \{1, \dots N\} \right\}\,.$$

Hence we have

$$\min_{U \in G} \left(\alpha \max_{i \in \{1,\dots,M\}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij} + \beta \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij} \right) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad AUB^T = W \tag{5}$$

for the constrained problem and

$$\min_{U\in G}\left(\frac{1}{2}\left\|\gamma(AUB^T-W)\right\|_F^2+\alpha\max_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}}\sum_{j=1}^{N}u_{ij}+\beta\sum_{i=1}^{M}\sum_{j=1}^{N}u_{ij}\right) \tag{6}$$

for the unconstrained problem.

In order to make these problems more easily accessible, we reformulate the $\ell^{1,\infty}$-term in (5) and (6) via a linear constraint:

Theorem 1 (Nonnegative $\ell^{1,\infty}$-Regularization)**.**
Let $F:\mathbb{R}^{M\times N}\longrightarrow\mathbb{R}\cup\{+\infty\}$ be a convex functional. Let $\widehat{U}$ be a minimizer of

$$\min_{U\in G}\left(F(U)+\alpha\max_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}}\sum_{j=1}^{N}u_{ij}\right) \tag{7}$$

and let $(\bar{U},\bar{v})$ minimize

$$\min_{U\in G,\ v\in\mathbb{R}^+}F(U)+v\quad s.t.\quad \alpha\sum_{j=1}^{N}u_{ij}\le v\quad\forall i\in\{1,\dots,M\}\,. \tag{8}$$

Then $\bar{U}$ is a minimizer of (7) and $(\widehat{U},\hat{v})$ with $\hat{v}=\alpha\max_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}}\sum_{j=1}^{N}\hat{u}_{ij}$ minimize (8).

Proof.
By introducing the constraint

$$v=\alpha\max_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}}\sum_{j=1}^{N}u_{ij}$$

in problem (7), we obtain

$$\min_{U\in G}F(U)+v\quad\text{s.t.}\quad\alpha\max_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}}\sum_{j=1}^{N}u_{ij}=v\,,$$

which is an equivalent formulation of (7). Now let us consider the inequality-constrained problem (8). In case that $\alpha\max_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}}\sum_{j=1}^{N}u_{ij}<v$ holds in (8), the couple (U,v) cannot minimize (8), since we can choose $\bar{v}<v$, which is still feasible and reduces the objective. Thus in the optimal case of problem (8) the inequality constraint yields the equality constraint, i.e.

$$\alpha\max_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}}\sum_{j=1}^{N}\bar{u}_{ij}=\bar{v}$$

and we see that $\bar{U}$ is a minimizer of (7) and $(\widehat{U},\hat{v})$ with $\hat{v}=\alpha\max_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}}\sum_{j=1}^{N}\hat{u}_{ij}$ minimize (8). □

By using Theorem 1 and defining F as the sum of the non-negative $\ell^{1,1}$-term and the characteristic function χ for the data constraint, i.e.

$$F(U) = \beta \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij} + \chi_{\{U \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N} \,|\, AUB^T = W\}}$$

with

$$\chi_{\{U \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N} \,|\, AUB^T = W\}} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } AUB^T = W, \\ \infty & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$

we are able to reformulate problem (5) as

$$\min_{U \in G,\, v \in \mathbb{R}^+} \; \beta \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij} + \chi_{\{U \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N} \,|\, AUB^T = W\}} + v \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \alpha \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij} \leq v \; . \tag{9}$$

Likewise we obtain the unconstrained problem from (6) as

$$\min_{U \in G,\, v \in \mathbb{R}^+} \; \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma \left(AUB^T - W \right) \right\|_F^2 + \beta \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij} + v \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \alpha \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij} \leq v \tag{10}$$

by using the sum of the data fidelity and the non-negative $\ell^{1,1}$-term as functional F.

In order to understand the potential exactness of sparse reconstructions, we will focus on the analysis of (9) in Section 3, however, (10) is clearly more useful in practical situations when the data are not exact. Thus it builds the basis for most of the further analysis and in particular for computational investigations.

However, we firstly propose another formulation, which shall make the problem more easily accessible for the numerical solution. For this reformulation we show in Subsection 2.4 that $\max\limits_{i \in \{1,\ldots,M\}} \sum\limits_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij}(\alpha)$ depends continuously on the regularization parameter α in problem (7). Then we prove that $\alpha \mapsto \max\limits_{i \in \{1,\ldots,M\}} \sum\limits_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij}(\alpha)$ is monotonically decreasing and finally we analyze its limits for α going to zero and infinity. We can then show that under certain circumstances the support of the minimizers of (7) and

$$\min_{U \in G} \; F\left(U\right) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij} \leq \tilde{v} \tag{11}$$

coincide for a certain fixed $\tilde{v}$. Thus instead of regularizing with α we can now use $\tilde{v}$ as a regularization parameter.

2.2 Existence and Uniqueness

Let us now discuss some basic properties of $\ell^{1,\infty}$-regularized variational problems. We show that there exists a minimizer for these problems and discuss potential uniqueness.

2.2.1 Existence

Since the $\ell^{1,\infty}$-regularization functional is a norm it is also convex. This holds for the non-negative formulation (12) as well, which directly follows from the fact that we add the characteristic function of a convex set to the convex norm functional:

Proposition 1 (Convexity of the Non-Negative $\ell^{1,\infty}$-Functional)**.**
Let be $U \in \mathbb{R}^{M\times N}$. The functional

$$\mathcal{R}(U) := \begin{cases} \max\limits_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}} \sum\limits_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij} & \text{if } u_{ij} \geq 0, \\ \infty & \text{else,} \end{cases} \tag{12}$$

is convex.

Proposition 2 (Lower Semi-Continuity)**.**
Let $F : \mathbb{R}^{M\times N} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ be a convex functional. Then (7) *and* (8) *are lower semi-continuous.*

Proof.
Since $F(U)$ is convex, we can conclude that (7) is convex by using Proposition 1. Due to Theorem 1 we deduce that (8) is convex as well.

Our problem is finite dimensional and hence all norms are equivalent. In addition it contains only linear inequalities. Therefore, we can deduce lower semi-continuity directly from convexity, which we already have. □

Let us now analyze the existence of minimizers of the different problems.

Theorem 2 (Existence of a Minimizer of the Constrained Problem)**.**
Let there be at least one $\widetilde{U} \in G$ that satisfies $A\widetilde{U}B^T = W$. Then there exists a minimizer of the constrained problems (5) *and* (9)*.*

Proof.
Since we only have linear parts, we see that

$$F(U) := \beta \sum_{i=1}^{M}\sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij} + \chi_{\{U\in\mathbb{R}^{M\times N} \,|\, AUB^T=W\}}$$

is convex. Then Proposition 2 leads to lower semi-continuity of (5) and (9).

We still need to show that there exists a ξ such that the sublevel set

$$\mathcal{S}_\xi = \left\{ U \in G \;\middle|\; \beta \sum_{i=1}^{M}\sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij} + \alpha \max_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij} + \chi_{\{U\in\mathbb{R}^{M\times N} \,|\, AUB^T=W\}} \leq \xi \right\}$$

is compact and not empty.

With $\widetilde{U}$ we have a feasible element and we can define

$$\xi := \beta \sum_{i=1}^{M}\sum_{j=1}^{N} \tilde{u}_{ij} + \alpha \max_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \tilde{u}_{ij} \,.$$

Due to the fact that $\widetilde{U} \in \mathcal{S}_\xi$ holds, we see that $\mathcal{S}_\xi$ is not empty and since for all $U \in \mathcal{S}_\xi$ holds that

$$\|U\|_{1,\infty} \leq \frac{\xi}{\alpha} \quad \text{if} \quad \alpha \neq 0 \qquad \text{or} \qquad \|U\|_{1,1} \leq \frac{\xi}{\beta} \quad \text{if} \quad \beta \neq 0$$

and we have $u_{ij} \geq 0$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, M\}$ and $j \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$, the sublevel set $\mathcal{S}_\xi$ is bounded.

Our functional is finite dimensional, hence $\mathcal{S}_\xi$ is bounded in all norms. Furthermore, boundedness of $\mathcal{S}_\xi$ in combination with lower semi-continuity of (5) and (9) yields compactness of $\mathcal{S}_\xi$. Finally, we obtain the existence of a minimizer of the constrained problems (5) and (9). Note that we choose the minimizing v for problem (9) in accordance with Theorem 1. □

Theorem 3 (Existence of a Minimizer of the Unconstrained Problem)**.**
Let be $\alpha > 0$. Then there exists a minimizer of (6) *and* (10)*.*

Proof.
Obviously the functional

$$F(U) := \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma \left(AUB^T - W \right) \right\|_F^2 + \beta \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij}$$

is convex. By using Proposition 2 we obtain that (6) and (10) are lower semi-continuous. The sublevel set

$$\mathcal{S}_\xi = \left\{ U \in G \;\middle|\; \frac{1}{2} \left\| \gamma \left(AUB^T - W \right) \right\|_F^2 + \beta \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij} + \alpha \max_{i \in \{1,\ldots,M\}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij} \leq \xi \right\}$$

with

$$\xi := \frac{1}{2} \|\gamma W\|_F^2$$

is not empty, since we obviously have $0 \in \mathcal{S}_\xi$.
Analogously to the proof of Theorem 2, we see that $\mathcal{S}_\xi$ is bounded. Due to the finite dimensionality of the problem, we have compactness of the sublevel set $\mathcal{S}_\xi$. Together with semi-continuity we obtain existence of a minimizer of the unconstrained problems (6) and (10). Note that we choose again the minimizing v for problem (9) in accordance with Theorem 1. □

2.2.2 Uniqueness

Let us now shortly discuss potential uniqueness of the solutions of (9) and (10).

Theorem 4 (Restriction of the Solution Set)**.**
There exists a solution $(\bar{U},\ \bar{v})$ of (9) *and* (10) *with $\bar{v}$ minimal, i.e. $\bar{v} \leq v$ for all minimizers $(U,\ v)$. Furthermore $\bar{v}$ is unique.*

Proof.
Obviously $\bar{v}$ can be defined as

$$\bar{v} := \inf \{ v \mid (U,\ v) \text{ is a minimizer of (8)} \}$$

with F as in (9), (10) respectively. Due to Theorem 2 and 3, we know that $\bar{v} < \infty$ has to hold. We proof the assumption via contradiction.

Assume there does not exist a $\bar{U}$ with $(\bar{U},\ \bar{v})$ being a minimizer of (9), (10) respectively. We can find a sequence of minimizers $(U_k,\ v_k)$ with $v_k \to \bar{v}$. U_k is bounded, since $U_k \in \mathcal{S}_\xi$ holds for all k. Thus there exists a converging subsequence $(U_{k_l},\ v_{k_l})$. Finally, lower semi-continuity provides us with the limit $(\bar{U},\ \bar{v})$ being a minimizer, which is a contradiction to the assumption. Furthermore, since we have $\bar{v} \in \mathbb{R}^+$, it is obviously unique. □

In Theorem 4 we have seen that we can reduce the solution set to those solutions with optimal v, i.e.

$$\mathcal{S} := \left\{(\bar{U},\ \bar{v}) \in G \times \mathbb{R}^+ \text{ is a minimizer of (8)} \mid \bar{v} \text{ minimal}\right\},$$

with F as in (9), (10) respectively. There always exists a unique $\bar{v} \in \mathbb{R}^+$, however, in general we are not able to deduce uniqueness for $(U,\ \bar{v}) \in G \times \mathbb{R}^+$.

2.3 The Subdifferential of the $\ell^{1,\infty}$-Norm for Matrices

In this subsection we characterize the subdifferentials of the $\ell^{1,\infty}$-norm and its nonnegative counterpart. Furthermore, we discuss what kind of solutions $\widehat{U}$ to $A\widehat{U}B^T = W$ are likely to meet a source condition for the $\ell^{1,\infty}$-regularization.

2.3.1 The Subdifferential of $\ell^{1,\infty}$

We start by computing the subdifferential of the $\ell^{1,\infty}$-norm. Note that while in general the subdifferential of a convex function J depending on a matrix $U \in \mathbb{R}^{M\times N}$ is defined as

$$\partial J(U) = \left\{P \in \mathbb{R}^{M\times N} \;\middle|\; J(V) - J(U) - \langle P, V-U\rangle_F \geq 0,\ \forall V \in \mathbb{R}^{M\times N}\right\}$$

with $\langle A, B\rangle_F = \sum_{i,j} A_{i,j}B_{i,j}$, one readily shows that the subdifferential of an absolutely 1-homogeneous convex functional may also be characterized as

$$\partial J(U) = \left\{P \in \mathbb{R}^{M\times N} \;\middle|\; J(U) = \langle P, U\rangle_F,\ J(V) \geq \langle P, V\rangle_F,\ \forall V \in \mathbb{R}^{M\times N}\right\}. \tag{13}$$

Theorem 5 (Subdifferential of the $\ell^{1,\infty}$-Functional)**.**
Let be $U,\ P \in \mathbb{R}^{M\times N}$. The subdifferential of $\|U\|_{1,\infty}$ can be characterized as follows: Let I be the set of indices, where U attains its maximum row-ℓ^1-norm, i.e.

$$I = \left\{ i \in \{1,\dots,M\} \;\middle|\; \sum_{j=1}^{N} |u_{ij}| = \max_{m\in\{1,\dots,M\}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} |u_{mj}| \right\}.$$

Then the following equivalence holds:

$$P \in \partial\|U\|_{1,\infty} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \begin{cases} p_{ij} = \omega_i\, sign(u_{ij}) & \text{if } i \in I, \\ p_{ij} = 0 & \text{if } i \notin I, \end{cases} \tag{14}$$

with weights $\omega_i \geq 0$ such that $\sum_{i\in I} \omega_i = 1$ holds if $U \not\equiv 0$ and $\sum_{i\in I} \omega_i \leq 1$ holds if $U \equiv 0$. By convention we use sign(0) to denote an arbitrary element in $[-1, 1]$.

Proof.
First, assume that a given P meets the conditions on the right hand side of (14). We have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{M}\sum_{j=1}^{N} p_{ij}u_{ij} = \sum_{i\in I}\sum_{j=1}^{N} \omega_i \operatorname{sign}(u_{ij})u_{ij} = \sum_{i\in I} \omega_i \sum_{j=1}^{N} |u_{ij}| = \|U\|_{1,\infty} \sum_{i\in I} \omega_i = \|U\|_{1,\infty}$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{M}\sum_{j=1}^{N} p_{ij}v_{ij} \leq \left|\sum_{i=1}^{M}\sum_{j=1}^{N} p_{ij}v_{ij}\right| \leq \sum_{i\in I}\sum_{j=1}^{N} |p_{ij}v_{ij}| \leq \sum_{i\in I}\omega_i \sum_{j=1}^{N} |v_{ij}|$$
$$\leq \sum_{i\in I}\omega_i \max_m \sum_{j=1}^{N} |v_{mj}| \leq \max_m \sum_{j=1}^{N} |v_{mj}| = \|V\|_{1,\infty} \, .$$

By the characterization of the subdifferential (13) we obtain $P \in \partial \|U\|_{1,\infty}$.

Now let $P \in \partial \|U\|_{1,\infty}$ be given. Note that the considered $\ell^{1,\infty}$ matrix norm, is also the operator norm induced by the ℓ^∞ vector norm, i.e.

$$\|U\|_{1,\infty} = \max_{\|v\|_\infty \leq 1} \|Uv\|_\infty .$$

The latter allows us to apply Theorem 4 of Watson in [57] and conclude that

$$\partial\|U\|_{1,\infty} = \operatorname{conv}\left\{ wv^T \;\middle|\; \|v\|_\infty = 1,\ Uv = \|U\|_{1,\infty} z,\ \|z\|_\infty = 1,\ w \in \partial\|z\|_\infty \right\}$$

holds, where $\operatorname{conv}\{\cdot\}$ shall denote the convex hull. We will first show that every $P = wv^T$ from the above set can be written as the claimed right hand side in (14) and conclude by noting that the right hand side in (14) corresponds to a convex set. For $P = wv^T$ the above conditions imply that there is at least one $i \in I$ such that $v_j = \operatorname{sign}(u_{ij})$ or $v_j = -\operatorname{sign}(u_{ij})$ is true. For every i where the above holds, we have either $z_i = 1$ or $z_i = -1$ (unless we have $U \equiv 0$, which we will consider later). Now $w \in \partial\|z\|_\infty$ means that we have $w_i = 0$ in case that $|z_i| < 1$ holds and $w_i = z_i\omega_i$ with $\omega_i \geq 0$ and $\sum_i \omega_i = 1$, else. Noting that the ambiguity in the sign of v_j cancels after the multiplication with $w_i = z_i\omega_i$ yields the equivalence to our characterization in the case of $U \not\equiv 0$. Otherwise v and u are arbitrary, which particularly means that w is any element in $\partial\|0\|_\infty$, i.e. $\|w\|_1 \leq 1$. Thus, the subdifferential becomes the set of all wv^T such that $\|w\|_1 \leq 1$ and $\|v\|_\infty \leq 1$ hold, which yields our second assertion since we have $I = \{1, \ldots, M\}$.

Finally, note that for P_1 and P_2 both meeting the right hand side of our claimed characterization of the subdifferential (i.e. meeting Watson's conditions without $\operatorname{conv}\{\cdot\}$) we find that $\alpha P_1 + (1 - \alpha P_2)$, $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, again meets the conditions of our right hand side, such that we can conclude the convexity of the set. □

One particular thing we can see from Theorem 5 is that $P \in \partial\|U\|_{1,\infty}$ for an arbitrary U meets

$$\|P\|_{\infty,1} = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \max_{j\in\{1,\ldots,N\}} |p_{ij}| \leq 1$$

and

$$\|P\|_{\infty,1} = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \max_{j\in\{1,\ldots,N\}} |p_{ij}| = 1 \qquad \text{for} \qquad U \not\equiv 0 \, .$$

Thus we see that the $\ell^{\infty,1}$-norm is the dual to the $\ell^{1,\infty}$-norm, which has already been observed by Tropp in [52].

2.3.2 The Subdifferential of the Nonnegative $\ell^{1,\infty}$-Formulation

Let us now consider the nonnegative $\ell^{1,\infty}$-functional (12).

Theorem 6 (Subdifferential of the Nonnegative $\ell^{1,\infty}$-Functional)**.**
Let $P^{1,\infty} \in \mathbb{R}^{M\times N}$ be the subdifferential of the $\ell^{1,\infty}$-norm characterized as before in (14) *and let $p_{ij}^{1,\infty}$ be its entries for $i \in \{1,\dots,M\}$ and $j \in \{1,\dots,N\}$. Then the subdifferential of the nonnegative $\ell^{1,\infty}$-functional*

$$\mathcal{R}(U) := \begin{cases} \max\limits_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}} \sum\limits_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij} & \text{if } u_{ij} \geq 0, \\ \infty & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$

can be characterized as

$$P \in \partial\mathcal{R}(U) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad p_{ij} = p_{ij}^{1,\infty} + \mu_{ij} \ ,$$

where μ_{ij} for all $i \in \{1,\dots,M\},\ j \in \{1,\dots,N\}$ are the Lagrange parameters with

$$\mu_{ij} \begin{cases} = 0 & \text{if } u_{ij} \neq 0, \\ \leq 0 & \text{if } u_{ij} = 0. \end{cases}$$

Proof.
$\mathcal{R}(U)$ can be written using the characteristic function, i.e.

$$\mathcal{R}(U) = \|U\|_{1,\infty} + \chi_{\{U\in\mathbb{R}^{M\times N} \,|\, u_{ij}\geq 0 \ \forall\, i\in\{1,\dots,M\},\, j\in\{1,\dots,N\}\}} \ .$$

In case that the subdifferential is additive, we have

$$\partial\mathcal{R}(U) = \partial \|U\|_{1,\infty} + \partial\chi_{\{U\in\mathbb{R}^{M\times N} \,|\, u_{ij}\geq 0 \ \forall\, i\in\{1,\dots,M\},\, j\in\{1,\dots,N\}\}}$$

and directly obtain

$$P \in \partial\mathcal{R}(U) \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad p_{ij} = p_{ij}^{1,\infty} + \mu_{ij} \ .$$

In order to prove that in this case the subdifferential is additive, we have to show that the following two conditions hold (cf. [17, Chapter 1, Proposition 5.6]):

1. $\|U\|_{1,\infty}$ and $\chi_{\{U\in\mathbb{R}^{M\times N} \,|\, u_{ij}\geq 0 \ \forall\, i,\, j\}}$ are proper, convex and lower semi-continuous,
2. there exists a $\bar{U} \in \operatorname{dom}\|U\|_{1,\infty} \cap \operatorname{dom}\chi_{\{U\in\mathbb{R}^{M\times N} \,|\, u_{ij}\geq 0 \ \forall\, i,\, j\}}$, where one of the two functionals is continuous.

This is quite easy to see:

1. Since $\|U\|_{1,\infty}$ is a norm, it is naturally proper and convex. Furthermore, we see that $\chi_{\{U\in\mathbb{R}^{M\times N} \,|\, u_{ij}\geq 0 \ \forall\, i\in\{1,\dots,M\},\, j\in\{1,\dots,N\}\}}$ is obviously proper. It is also convex, since the characteristic function of a convex set is also convex. Both functionals are lower semi-continuous, since we are in a finite dimensional setting.
2. Let $\bar{u}_{ij} > 0$ hold for all $i \in \{1,\dots,M\}$ and $j \in \{1,\dots,N\}$. Then we have

   $$\bar{U} \in \operatorname{dom}\|U\|_{1,\infty} \cap \operatorname{dom}\chi_{\{U\in\mathbb{R}^{M\times N} \,|\, u_{ij}\geq 0 \ \forall\, i,\, j\}} \ .$$

   Furthermore, both functionals are continuous at $\bar{U}$.

Thus we see that the subdifferential is additive and we obtain the assumption. □

Remark 1.
Clearly $P \in \partial\mathcal{R}(U)$ can be characterized as follows:

$$p_{ij} \begin{cases} = 0 & \text{if } i \notin I \text{ and } u_{ij} \neq 0, \\ \leq 0 & \text{if } i \notin I \text{ and } u_{ij} = 0, \\ = \omega_i & \text{if } i \in I \text{ and } u_{ij} > 0, \\ \in [-\omega_i, \omega_i] & \text{if } i \in I \text{ and } u_{ij} = 0, \\ = -\omega_i & \text{if } i \in I \text{ and } u_{ij} < 0. \end{cases}$$

2.3.3 Source Conditions

Knowing the characterization of the subgradient, we can state a condition, which allows us to determine whether a certain solution to $AUB^T = W$ is $\ell^{1,\infty}$-minimizing. We will call this condition a *source condition* as used in the inverse problem and error estimate literature e.g. in [19, 6, 46]. However, we would like to point out that similar conditions have been called *dual certificate* in the compressed sensing literature (c.f. [60, 8, 7, 13]).

Definition 2.
We say that a solution $\widehat{U}$ of $A\widehat{U}B^T = W$ meets a source condition with respect to a proper, convex regularization functional J if there exists a Q such that $P = A^TQB \in \partial J(\widehat{U})$.

The source condition of some $\widehat{U}$ with respect to J is nothing but the optimality condition for $\widehat{U}$ being a J-minimizing solution to $A\widehat{U}B^T = W$.

Lemma 1 (cf. [6])**.**
Let $\widehat{U}$ with $A\widehat{U}B^T = W$ meet a source condition with respect to J. Then $\widehat{U}$ is a J-minimizing solution.

Considering this, the next question naturally emerges for our characterization of the subdifferential, i.e what kind of solutions $\widehat{U}$ to $A\widehat{U}B^T = W$ are likely to meet a source condition for $\ell^{1,\infty}$-regularization. Particularly, we are interested in investigating how likely $\ell^{0,\infty}$-minimizing solutions are to meet a source condition.
Due to the similarity between the subgradient of the ℓ^1-norm and the subgradient of $\ell^{1,\infty}$-norm at rows with index $i \in I$, we can make the following simple observation:

Lemma 2.
Let $\widehat{U}$ be an ℓ^1-minimizing solution to $A\widehat{U}B^T = W$ for which we have $\sum_{j=1}^N |\hat{u}_{ij}| = \sum_{j=1}^N |\hat{u}_{mj}|$ for all $i, m \in \{1, \dots, M\}$, then $\widehat{U}$ also is an $\ell^{1,\infty}$-minimizing solution.

Proof.
The ℓ^1-subgradient divided by the number of rows is an $\ell^{1,\infty}$-subgradient. □

The above lemma particularly shows that exact recovery criteria for the properties of the sensing matrix $\operatorname{kron}(B, A)$ (like the Restricted Isometry Property [9], the Null Space Property [14, 11] or the Mutual Incoherence Property [14]), are sufficient for the exact recovery of sparse solutions with the same ℓ^1-norm in each row.

Of course, we do expect to recover more $\ell^{0,\infty}$-minimizing solutions than just the ones with the same row-ℓ^1-norm. Looking at the characterization of the subdifferential (cf. Remark 1), we can observe that there are two cases that pose much more severe restrictions, i.e. the

equality constraints, than the two other cases (which only lead to inequality constraints). Thus we generally expect solutions, which require only a few of the equality constraints to be more likely to meet a source condition. As we can see equality constraints need to be met for nonzero elements, such that the $\ell^{1,\infty}$-regularization prefers sparse solutions. Additionally, the constraints are less restrictive if the corresponding row has maximal ℓ^1-norm. Thus we expect those solutions to be likely to meet a source condition that reach a maximal ℓ^1-norm in as many rows as possible while being sparse. Naturally, these solutions will be row-sparse, which further justifies the idea that the $\ell^{1,\infty}$-norm can be used as a convex approximation of the $\ell^{0,\infty}$-problem.

2.4 Equivalence of Formulations

In this subsection we will show that the minimizers of (7) and (11) coincide under certain circumstances. In order to do so, we examine how the regularization parameter $\alpha > 0$ is connected to the minimizer of (7). For this purpose we first prove the continuity and monotonicity of

$$\alpha \mapsto \max_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij}(\alpha) \; . \tag{15}$$

Afterwards, we shall investigate the meaning of $\tilde{v}$ in (11) and its connection to the minimizer of $F(U)$ with minimal $\ell^{1,\infty}$-norm. Analyzing the limits of (15) leads us to the main result of this subsection and the connection between the two problems (7) and (11).

Remark 2.
For most of the proofs in this subsection we require $F(U)$ to be continuous. Thus most of the results are not useful for the constrained problem (5)*, since*

$$F(U) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } AUB^T = W, \\ \infty & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$

is not continuous. Nevertheless, in reality we have to deal with noisy data anyway and thus we only want to implement the unconstrained problem (6)*. This will become easier, since we can simply use its reformulation* (11)*, which we will summarize in Theorem 7.*

For this subsection we define the functional $J_\alpha : G \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ via

$$J_\alpha(U) := F(U) + \alpha \max_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij} \; . \tag{16}$$

Lemma 3 (Continuity of (15))**.**
Let $F : \mathbb{R}^{M\times N} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be a convex continuous functional with bounded sublevel sets. Let $U(\alpha) \in G$ be a minimizer of J_α with $\|U(\alpha)\|_{1,\infty}$ minimal. Then any other minimizer $V \in G$ of J_α satisfies

$$\max_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} v_{ij} = \max_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij}(\alpha) \tag{17}$$

and the consequently well-defined map $\alpha \mapsto \max_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij}(\alpha)$ is a continuous function.

Proof.
Analogous to the arguments in [6] we conclude that the Bregman distance $D_R(U(\alpha), V)$ vanishes, with the convex regularization functional $R(V) = \max_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} v_{ij}$. The one-homogeneity of R then immediately implies $R(V) = R(U(\alpha))$. Note further that due to the minimizing property we also have $J_\alpha(V) = J_\alpha(U(\alpha))$.

Let U_k be a minimizer of J_{α_k} and let $\alpha_k \to \alpha$ be a sequence of regularization parameters. Due to boundedness, we are able to find subsequences $U_{k_l} \to U$. Because of the convergence of the subsequences $R(U_k)$ and $J_{\alpha_K}(U_k)$ and the uniqueness of their limits, the limits of all subsequences are equal and we obtain convergence of the whole sequences $R(U_k) \to R(U)$ and $J_{\alpha_k}(U_k) \to J(U)$. We proceed by contradiction and claim that U is not a minimizer of J_α. In this case there would exist a $\widetilde{U}$ with

$$J_\alpha(\widetilde{U}) < J_\alpha(U) \ . \tag{18}$$

Let us consider

$$\begin{aligned} J_\alpha\left(\frac{\alpha_k}{\alpha}\widetilde{U}\right) &= F\left(\frac{\alpha_k}{\alpha}\widetilde{U}\right) + \alpha_k \max_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \tilde{u}_{ij} \\ &= J_{\alpha_k}(\widetilde{U}) + F\left(\frac{\alpha_k}{\alpha}\widetilde{U}\right) - F(\widetilde{U}) \ . \end{aligned}$$

The continuity of F yields

$$F\left(\frac{\alpha_k}{\alpha}\widetilde{U}\right) - F(\widetilde{U}) \to 0$$

for $k \to \infty$. Since J is continuous, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} J_{\alpha_k}(\widetilde{U}) &\to J_\alpha(\widetilde{U}) \qquad \text{and} \\ J_{\alpha_k}(U_k) &\to J_\alpha(U) \end{aligned}$$

hold for $k \to \infty$. By using (18), we see that the inequality

$$J_{\alpha_k}(\widetilde{U}) < J_{\alpha_k}(U_k)$$

has to hold as well. This is a contradiction to the assumption that U_k is a minimizer of J_{α_k}. Hence U has to be a minimizer of J_α and we see that $\alpha \mapsto \alpha \max_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij}(\alpha)$ is continuous. Thus we also know that (15) is continuous on $(0, \infty)$. □

Another well-known result is the monotonicity of the regularization (cf. [50] for a more general statement):

Lemma 4 (Monotonicity of (15))**.**
Let $F : \mathbb{R}^{M\times N} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be a convex continuous functional with bounded sublevel sets. Let $U(\alpha) \in G$ be a minimizer of J_α with $\|U(\alpha)\|_{1,\infty}$ minimal.
Then $\alpha \mapsto \max_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij}(\alpha)$ is a monotonically decreasing function.

Lemma 5.
Let $F : \mathbb{R}^{M\times N} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be a convex continuous functional with bounded sublevel sets. Let $\bar{U} \in G$ be a solution of (11) such that $\sum_{j=1}^{N} \bar{u}_{ij} < \tilde{v}$ holds for all $i \in \{1,\dots,M\}$.
Then we have $\tilde{v} > \|\widehat{U}\|_{1,\infty}$, where $\widehat{U} \in G$ is a minimizer of $F(U)$ with $\|U\|_{1,\infty}$ minimal and vice versa.

Proof.
Let be $\tilde{v} > \|\widehat{U}\|_{1,\infty}$, then $\widehat{U}$ is feasible for (11) and obviously a minimizer as well.
Let be $\tilde{v} \leq \|\widehat{U}\|_{1,\infty}$. Then in case that $\sum_{j=1}^{N} \bar{u}_{ij} < \tilde{v}$ holds for all $i \in \{1,\dots,M\}$, we obviously have $\bar{U} \not\equiv \widehat{U}$ and thus we obtain

$$F(\bar{U}) > F(\widehat{U}) \,,$$

since $\widehat{U}$ is a minimizer of F with $\|\widehat{U}\|_{1,\infty}$ minimal. Due to convexity, we obtain

$$F(\varepsilon\widehat{U} + (1-\varepsilon)\bar{U}) \leq \varepsilon F(\widehat{U}) + (1-\varepsilon)F(\bar{U}) < F(\bar{U})$$

and for small ε we have

$$\varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^{N} \hat{u}_{ij} + (1-\varepsilon) \sum_{j=1}^{N} \bar{u}_{ij} \leq \tilde{v} \,.$$

Thus we have found an element with smaller value of F as the minimizer $\bar{U}$, which is a contradiction. □

Lemma 6 (Limits of (15))**.**
Let $F : \mathbb{R}^{M\times N} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be a convex continuous functional with bounded sublevel sets. Then we have

$$\max_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij}(\alpha) \to 0 \qquad \textit{for} \quad \alpha \to \infty \qquad \textit{and}$$
$$\max_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij}(\alpha) \to \|\widehat{U}\|_{1,\infty} \quad \textit{for} \quad \alpha \to 0$$

with $\widehat{U} \in G$ being a minimizer of F with $\|U\|_{1,\infty}$ minimal.

Proof.
Let $U(\alpha)$ be a minimizer of J_α as proposed in (16).

1. Consider the case of $\alpha \to \infty$. $U \equiv 0$ is feasible for J_α, thus we obtain

$$F\left(U(\alpha)\right) + \alpha \max_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij}(\alpha) \leq F(0) \,.$$

Therefore, $\alpha \max_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij}(\alpha)$ is bounded by $F(0)$ and we have

$$\max_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij}(\alpha) \to 0 \quad \text{for} \quad \alpha \to \infty \,.$$

2. Now consider the case of $\alpha \to 0$. We can find a subsequence $\alpha_k \to 0$ such that

$$U(\alpha_k) \to \widehat{U}$$

holds, where $\widehat{U}$ is a minimizer of F with $\|U\|_{1,\infty}$ minimal. Obviously $\widehat{U}$ is feasible for J_{α_k}. Hence we obtain

$$F(U(\alpha_k)) + \alpha_k \max_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij}(\alpha_k) \leq F(\widehat{U}) + \alpha_k \|\widehat{U}\|_{1,\infty} .$$

Since $\widehat{U}$ is a minimizer of F, it has to hold that $F(U(\alpha_k)) \geq F(\widehat{U})$ and thus we obtain

$$\max_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij}(\alpha_k) \leq \|\widehat{U}\|_{1,\infty} .$$

Obviously $U(\alpha)$ is feasible for (11) with

$$\tilde{v} = \max_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij}(\alpha_k) .$$

Then Lemma 5 yields

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij}(\alpha_k) = \max_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij}(\alpha_k) = \|U(\alpha_k)\|_{1,\infty} \quad \text{for some } i \in \{1,\dots,M\} .$$

Due to the lower semi-continuity of the norm, we obtain

$$\liminf_{\alpha_k\to 0} \max_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij}(\alpha_k) = \liminf_{\alpha_k\to 0} \|U(\alpha_k)\|_{1,\infty} \geq \|\widehat{U}\|_{1,\infty}$$

and finally we have

$$\max_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij}(\alpha) \to \|\widehat{U}\|_{1,\infty} \quad \text{for} \quad \alpha \to 0 .$$

□

In Figure 1 we see an example on how the function

$$v(\alpha) := \max_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij}(\alpha)$$

could look, where $U(\alpha) \in G$ is a minimizer of J_α with $\|U(\alpha)\|_{1,\infty}$ minimal.



Figure 1: Illustration of the relation between the regularization parameter α and the non-negative $\ell^{1,\infty}$-norm $v(\alpha)$ of the corresponding minimizer as defined above

Remark 3.
In case that $\partial F(0) \neq \emptyset$ holds, we have

$$\max_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij}(\alpha) = 0$$

already for $\alpha < \infty$, but large enough.
We see this by considering $P_0 \in \partial F(0)$ and then selecting $P = -\frac{1}{\alpha}P_0$. Here we choose α large enough that we have $\|P\|_{\infty,1} < 1$ and obtain

$$\langle P, V\rangle_F \leq \|P\|_{\infty,1}\, J(V) \leq J(V)\ .$$

Thus P is a subgradient at $U(\alpha) = 0$ and we see that the optimality condition is fulfilled.

Finally, we can conclude the following essential statement:

Theorem 7 (Connection of the Solutions of (8) and (11))**.**
Let $F : \mathbb{R}^{M\times N} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be a convex continuous functional with bounded sublevel sets. Let be $\tilde{v} \in (0, \|\widehat{U}\|_{1,\infty})$, where $\widehat{U}$ is a minimizer of $F(U)$ with $\|U\|_{1,\infty}$ minimal. Let $\bar{U} \in G$ be a solution of

$$\min_{U\in G} F(U) \quad s.\ t. \quad \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij} \leq \tilde{v}\ . \tag{11}$$

Then there exists an $\alpha > 0$ such that $\bar{U}$ is a solution of

$$\min_{U\in G} F(U) + \alpha \max_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij}\ . \tag{7}$$

Remark 4.
If U is a solution of (11), we can directly decide, whether there exists an α for this problem, i.e. in the case of

$$\tilde{v} = \|U\|_{1,\infty}\ .$$

Theorem 8 (Existence of a Solution of (11))**.**
Let $F : \mathbb{R}^{M\times N} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be a convex continuous functional with bounded sublevel sets. Then there exists a minimizer of (11)*.*

Proof.
We can write (11) using the characteristic function, i.e.

$$\min_{U\in G} \; F(U) + \chi_{\left\{U\in\mathbb{R}^{M\times N} \,|\, \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij} \le \tilde{v} \;\forall\, i\in\{1,\dots,M\}\right\}} \,.$$

For $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ we consider the sublevel set

$$\mathcal{S}_\xi = \left\{ U \in G \,|\, F(U) + \chi_{\left\{U\in\mathbb{R}^{M\times N} \,|\, \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij} \le \tilde{v} \;\forall\, i\in\{1,\dots,M\}\right\}} \le \xi \right\} \,.$$

Since F is continuous and $\chi(0) = 0$ holds, we have $0 \in \mathcal{S}_\xi$ and thus $\mathcal{S}_\xi$ is not empty. Furthermore, $\mathcal{S}_\xi$ is bounded, since the norm of U is bounded. Additionally, the functional stays lower semicontinuous and we obtain the existence of a minimizer of (11). □

By using Theorem 7 for problem (10), we obtain

$$\min_{U\in G} \frac{1}{2} \left\|\gamma\left(AUB^T - W\right)\right\|_F^2 + \beta \sum_{i=1}^{M}\sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij} \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij} \le \tilde{v} \,. \tag{19}$$

Note that we need to look for a suitable regularization parameter in the implementation anyway. Thus we can instead determine a suitable $\tilde{v}$ and obtain an easier optimization problem.

2.5 Asymptotic 1-Sparsity

In this section we consider the asymptotics of our reformulated problem (19) with $\beta = 0$ and $\gamma = 1$, i.e.

$$\min_{U\in G} \; \frac{1}{2} \left\|AUB^T - W\right\|_F^2 \qquad \text{s. t.} \qquad \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij} \le \tilde{v} \,, \tag{20}$$

where the $\ell^{1,\infty}$-regularization gains more and more influence, which means that the regularization parameter $\tilde{v}$ shall go to zero. In the limit case we observe that we indeed obtain a special kind of sparsity in every row, i.e. we are able to determine the number of nonzero elements in each row. In a special case we are moreover able to locate the nonzero entries of a solution of (20) even if $\tilde{v}$ is nonzero but small enough.

In order to analyze (20) asymptotically, we consider the rescaling $X := \tilde{v}^{-1}U \Leftrightarrow U = \tilde{v}X$ and obtain the new variational problem

$$\min_{X\in G} \; \frac{1}{2} \left\|\tilde{v}AXB^T - W\right\|_F^2 \qquad \text{s. t.} \qquad \sum_{j=1}^{N} x_{ij} \le 1 \,. \tag{21}$$

Let us now analyze the structure of a solution of (21) for $\tilde{v} \to 0$.

Theorem 9.
Let k_i be the number of maxima in the ith row of $Y := A^TWB$ and let $X(\tilde{v})$ be a minimizer of (21)*. Then the ith row of*

$$\bar{X} := \lim_{\tilde{v}\to 0} X(\tilde{v})$$

is at most k_i-sparse.

Proof.
After simplifying the norm and dividing by $\tilde{v}$ in (21), we can equivalently consider

$$\min_{X\in G} \frac{\tilde{v}}{2} \left\|AXB^T\right\|_F^2 - \left\langle AXB^T, W\right\rangle_F \qquad \text{s. t.} \qquad \sum_{j=1}^{N} x_{ij} \leq 1 \,,$$

where $\langle C, D\rangle_F := \sum_{l=1}^{L}\sum_{k=1}^{T} c_{ij}d_{ij}$ denotes the Frobenius inner product. For the case that we have $\tilde{v} \to 0$, the first summand tends to zero and thus

$$\max_{X\in G} \left\langle X, A^TWB\right\rangle_F \qquad \text{s. t.} \qquad \sum_{j=1}^{N} x_{ij} \leq 1 \tag{22}$$

holds. With the above definition of Y we shall now consider

$$\max_{X\in G} \sum_{i=1}^{M}\sum_{j=1}^{N} y_{ij}x_{ij} \qquad \text{s. t.} \qquad \sum_{j=1}^{N} x_{ij} \leq 1 \,.$$

Let J_i be the column index set at which the maximum of the ith row of Y is reached, i.e.

$$J_i = \{n \in \{1,\dots,N\} \,|\, y_{in} \geq y_{ij} \;\forall\, j \in \{1,\dots,N\}\}$$

for every $i \in \{1,\dots,M\}$. Since we have the constraint that the row sum of X should not exceed 1, we obtain the inequality

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N} y_{ij}x_{ij} \leq y_{in} \qquad \forall\, n \in J_i$$

for every $i \in \{1,\dots,M\}$. Hence we see that for a solution of (22) has to hold

$$\sum_{n\in J_i} x_{in} = 1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad x_{ij} = 0 \quad \forall\, j \notin J_i \,.$$

This means that the ith row of the solution of (22) has at most k_i nonzero entries. Thus the ith row of $\bar{X}$ is at most k_i-sparse, maybe even sparser. □

Remark 5.
In case that the ith row of $\bar{X}$ is k_i-sparse, the asymptotic solution $\bar{X}$ has nonzero entries at the same positions as $Y = A^TWB$ has its maxima in each row.
Note that the row-maxima are not necessarily unique. However, in the case that for every $i \in \{1,\dots,M\}$ the index set J_i contains only one element, the rows of $\bar{X}$ are 1-sparse.

Theorem 9 raises the question, whether there exists a small regularization parameter $\tilde{v}$, for which $X(\tilde{v})$ is already k_i-sparse. In this case we could apply this knowledge to the original problem (20), which is not possible in the limit case, since then $\bar{U} := \lim_{\tilde{v}\to 0} U(\tilde{v})$ would be equal to zero.

Theorem 10.
Let the ℓ^2-norm of the columns of $A \in \mathbb{R}^{L\times M}$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{T\times N}$ be nonzero, i.e.

$$\|a_{\cdot i}\|_2 > 0 \quad \forall\, i \in \{1,\dots,M\} \qquad \textit{and} \qquad \|b_{\cdot j}\|_2 > 0 \quad \forall\, j \in \{1,\dots,N\} \,.$$

Then there exists a regularization parameter $\tilde{v} > 0$ such that the solution of (20) has nonzero entries at the same positions as $Y := A^TWB$ has row-maxima.

Proof.
Let us consider the rescaled problem (21). After simplifying the norm and dividing by $\tilde{v}$, we consider equivalently

$$\min_{X\in G} \frac{\tilde{v}}{2} \left\|AXB^T\right\|_F^2 - \left\langle X, A^TWB\right\rangle_F \qquad \text{s. t.} \qquad \sum_{j=1}^{N} x_{ij} \leq 1$$

and thus we have

$$\min_{X\in G} \frac{\tilde{v}}{2} \sum_{l=1}^{L}\sum_{k=1}^{T} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{M}\sum_{j=1}^{N} a_{li}x_{ij}b_{kj}\right)^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{M}\sum_{j=1}^{N} x_{ij}y_{ij} \qquad \text{s. t.} \qquad \sum_{j=1}^{N} x_{ij} \leq 1 \ ,$$

where we use again $Y := A^TWB$. The Lagrange functional reads as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}(X;\lambda,\mu) = \frac{\tilde{v}}{2} \sum_{l=1}^{L}\sum_{k=1}^{T} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{M}\sum_{j=1}^{N} a_{li}x_{ij}b_{kj}\right)^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{M}\sum_{j=1}^{N} x_{ij}y_{ij} \\ + \sum_{i=1}^{M} \lambda_i \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N} x_{ij} - 1\right) - \sum_{i=1}^{M}\sum_{j=1}^{N} \mu_{ij}x_{ij}\end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_i \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_i \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N} x_{ij} - 1\right) = 0 \ , \\ \mu_{ij} \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_{ij}x_{ij} = 0 \ .\end{aligned}$$

Let us now consider the optimality condition

$$\begin{aligned} & 0 = \partial_{x_{ij}}\mathcal{L} = \tilde{v}x_{ij} \left\|a_{\cdot i}\right\|_2^2 \left\|b_{\cdot j}\right\|_2^2 + \tilde{v}h_{ij} - y_{ij} + \lambda_i - \mu_{ij} \\ \Leftrightarrow \quad & \tilde{v}x_{ij} \left\|a_{\cdot i}\right\|_2^2 \left\|b_{\cdot j}\right\|_2^2 = y_{ij} - \lambda_i + \mu_{ij} - \tilde{v}h_{ij} \ ,\end{aligned}$$

where h_{ij} denotes the sum of the mixed terms resulting from the data term, which are independent from x_{ij}, i.e.

$$h_{ij} := \sum_{m\neq i}\sum_{n\neq j} \left\langle a_{\cdot i}, a_{\cdot m}\right\rangle x_{mn} \left\langle b_{\cdot n}, b_{\cdot j}\right\rangle + \left\|b_{\cdot j}\right\|_2^2 \sum_{m\neq i} \left\langle a_{\cdot i}, a_{\cdot m}\right\rangle x_{mj} + \left\|a_{\cdot i}\right\|_2^2 \sum_{n\neq j} x_{in} \left\langle b_{\cdot n}, b_{\cdot j}\right\rangle \ .$$

Let now $\tilde{v} > 0$ hold and let J_i be the index set for which the entries of the ith row of the solution of (20) are nonzero. We show that $y_{ij} > y_{in}$ holds for all $j \in J_i$ and for all $n \notin J_i$. In order to do so, we consider

$$0 = \partial_{x_{ij}}\mathcal{L} - \partial_{x_{in}}\mathcal{L} \qquad \forall\, j \in J_i,\ \forall\, n \notin J_i \ .$$

We have $x_{ij} > 0$ and $\mu_{ij} = 0$, since it is $j \in J_i$. Furthermore, it holds that $x_{in} = 0$ and $\mu_{in} \geq 0$, since we have $n \notin J_i$. Thus we obtain

$$0 \leq \mu_{in} = y_{ij} - y_{in} + \tilde{v}\left(h_{in} - h_{ij}\right) - \tilde{v}x_{ij} \left\|a_{\cdot i}\right\|_2^2 \left\|b_{\cdot j}\right\|_2^2$$

and further

$$0 < \tilde{v} x_{ij} \left\| a_{\cdot i} \right\|_2^2 \left\| b_{\cdot j} \right\|_2^2 \leq y_{ij} - y_{in} + \tilde{v} \left(h_{in} - h_{ij} \right) \ ,$$

due to the fact that $\tilde{v},\ x_{ij},\ \left\| a_{\cdot i} \right\|_2^2$ and $\left\| b_{\cdot j} \right\|_2^2$ are positive. Hence it is left to show that

$$y_{ij} > y_{in} + \tilde{v} d_{ijn} \tag{23}$$

holds, where we define $d_{ijn} := h_{ij} - h_{in}$. This statement is obvious for $d_{ijn} \geq 0$. Let now $d_{ijn} < 0$ hold.
For $n \notin J_i$ we assume that $y_{in} = \max\limits_{\nu \in \{1,\ldots,N\}} y_{i\nu}$ holds. In addition let be $y_{in} \geq y_{ij} + 2\tilde{v}|d_{ijn}|$ for all $j \in J_i$. This is always possible, since we can choose $\tilde{v} > 0$ small enough. With (23) we have

$$y_{ij} > y_{in} - \tilde{v}|d_{ijn}|$$

and thus we obtain

$$y_{ij} + \tilde{v}|d_{ijn}| > y_{in} \geq y_{ij} + 2\tilde{v}|d_{ijn}| \qquad \forall\ j \in J_i \ ,$$

which is a contradiction. Hence we finally obtain that

$$y_{ij} > y_{in} \qquad \forall\ j \in J_i,\ \forall\ n \notin J_i$$

has to hold and we see that the solution X has nonzero entries at the same positions like $A^T W B$ has row-maxima, even for $\tilde{v} > 0$ but small enough. Then obviously the same holds for the solution of (20). □

3 Exact Recovery of Locally 1-Sparse Solutions

In this section we discuss the question of exact recovery for our model.

There already exist several conditions, which provide information about exact reconstruction using linearly independent subdictionaries, see for instance [24, 53]. Unlike the case, where the basis vectors are linearly independent, we consider the operator to be coherent, i.e. the *mutual incoherence parameter* (cf. [36, p. 3])

$$\mu(B) := \max_{i \neq j} \frac{|\langle b_i, b_j \rangle|}{\|b_i\|_2^2} \tag{24}$$

for $b_i,\ b_j$ being distant basis vectors, is large. In other words, the vectors are very similar. This is a reasonable assumption for many applications, see for instance the ones mentioned in the introduction as well as in Subsection 5.1.

In Appendix A we gain some understanding of necessary scaling conditions recovering locally 1-sparse solutions considering only one spacial dimension plus one additional dimension (such as e.g. time) using problem (4). We learn that if the solution is 1-sparse in one spacial dimension plus the additional dimension, the matrix $B \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times N}$ has to meet the scaling condition

$$\|\gamma b_n\|_{\ell^2} = 1 \qquad \text{and} \qquad |\langle \gamma b_n, \gamma b_m \rangle| \leq 1 \quad \text{for} \quad n \neq m \tag{25}$$

with $\gamma \neq 0$ in order to recover 1-sparse solutions.

3.1 Lagrange Functional and Optimality Conditions

In this subsection we introduce the Lagrange functional and optimality conditions of problem (9), which we will need in the further analysis.

We equivalently rewrite problem (9) by writing the data constraint for every l and k, i.e.

$$\min_{U\in G,\, v\in\mathbb{R}^+} \beta\sum_{i=1}^{M}\sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij} + v \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \alpha\sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij} \le v,\ \sum_{i=1}^{M}\sum_{j=1}^{N} a_{li}u_{ij}b_{kj} = w_{lk} \tag{26}$$

with $l \in \{1,\dots,L\}$ and $k \in \{1,\dots,T\}$. For this problem the Lagrange functional reads as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}(v,u_{ij};\lambda,\mu,\eta) = \beta\sum_{i=1}^{M}\sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij} + v + \sum_{i=1}^{M}\lambda_i\left(\alpha\sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij} - v\right) - \sum_{i=1}^{M}\sum_{j=1}^{N}\mu_{ij}u_{ij} \\ + \sum_{l=1}^{L}\sum_{k=1}^{T}\eta_{lk}\left(w_{lk} - \sum_{i=1}^{M}\sum_{j=1}^{N} a_{li}u_{ij}b_{kj}\right)\ ,\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

where λ, μ and η are Lagrange parameters. Now we are able to state the optimality conditions

$$0 = \partial_v\mathcal{L} \ = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{M}\lambda_i\ , \tag{OPT1}$$

$$0 = \partial_{u_{ij}}\mathcal{L} = \beta + \alpha\lambda_i - \mu_{ij} - \sum_{l=1}^{L}\sum_{k=1}^{T}\eta_{lk}a_{li}b_{kj}\ , \tag{OPT2}$$

with the complementary conditions (cf. [34, p. 305-306, Theorem 2.1.4])

$$\lambda_i \ge 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_i\left(v - \alpha\sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij}\right) = 0\ , \tag{28}$$

$$\mu_{ij} \ge 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_{ij}u_{ij} = 0\ . \tag{29}$$

3.2 Scaling Conditions for Exact Recovery of the Constrained Problem

On the basis of this insight, we examine under which assumptions a 1-sparse solution of the constrained $\ell^{0,\infty}$-problem can be reconstructed exactly by using the constrained $\ell^{1,\infty}$-$\ell^{1,1}$-minimization (26).

We will see that the scaling condition (25) in a slightly reformulated way is a sufficient condition for exact recovery.

Theorem 11 (Recovery of Locally 1-Sparse Data)**.**
Let be $c_i \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and let

$$\hat{u}_{ij} = \begin{cases} c_i & \text{if } j = J(i)\,, \\ 0 & \text{if } j \ne J(i)\,, \end{cases}$$

be the exact solution of the constrained non-negative $\ell^{0,\infty}$-problem

$$\min_{U\in G}\left(\max_{i\in\{1,\dots,M\}}\sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij}^0\right) \qquad \text{s. t.} \qquad AUB^T = W\ , \tag{30}$$

with the definition $0^0 := 0$. *Here* $J : \{1, ..., M\} \longrightarrow \{1, ..., N\}$ *with* $i \longmapsto J(i)$ *denotes the function that maps every index* $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ *to the index* $J(i) \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ *of the corresponding basis vector, where the coefficient* $\hat{u}_{iJ(i)}$ *is unequal to zero, i.e. the rows of* $\widehat{U}$ *shall be 1-sparse and shall have their nonzero entry at the index* $J(i)$. *Let* A^T *be surjective and let the scaling condition*

$$\left\|b_{J(i)}\right\|_2 = 1 \quad \textit{and} \quad \left|\left\langle b_{J(i)}, b_j \right\rangle\right| \leq 1 \quad \forall\, j \in \{1, \dots, N\} \tag{31}$$

hold for all $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$. *Then* $\left(\widehat{U},\ \alpha \max\limits_{p \in \{1,\dots,M\}} c_p\right)$ *is a solution of* (26).

Proof.
In order to proof Theorem 11, we have to show that there exist Lagrange parameters $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^M$, $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times T}$ such that $\widehat{U}$ fulfills the optimality conditions (OPT1) and (OPT2) with respect to the complimentary conditions (28) and (29).
We choose the Lagrange parameters for all $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ as follows:

$$\lambda_i = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{m} & \text{if } \ c_i = \frac{v}{\alpha}\,, \\ 0 & \text{if } \ c_i < \frac{v}{\alpha}\,, \end{cases}$$

with $\frac{v}{\alpha} = \max\limits_{p \in \{1,\dots,M\}} c_p$ and m being the number of indices, for which holds $c_i = \frac{v}{\alpha}$,

$$\mu_{ij} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \ j = J(i)\,, \\ (\alpha\lambda_i + \beta)\left(1 - \sum\limits_{k=1}^{T} b_{kJ(i)} b_{kj}\right) & \text{if } \ j \neq J(i)\,, \end{cases}$$

and η as solution of

$$\sum_{l=1}^{L} a_{li}\eta_{lk} = (\alpha\lambda_i + \beta)\, b_{kJ(i)} \qquad \forall\, i \in \{1, \dots, M\}\,,\ \forall\, k \in \{1, \dots, T\}\ . \tag{32}$$

Note that (32) is solvable, since A^T is surjective.

1. Let us show that (OPT1) and (28) hold for $\widehat{U}$:

   a) Obviously we have

   $$\sum_{i=1}^{M} \lambda_i = \sum_{\substack{i \in \{1,\dots,M|\\ c_i = \frac{v}{\alpha}\}}} \frac{1}{m} = m\frac{1}{m} = 1\ .$$

   Thus (OPT1) is fulfilled.

   b) In case that $c_i < \frac{v}{\alpha}$ holds, we see that (28) is trivially fulfilled. Hence let be $c_i = \frac{v}{\alpha}$. We consider

   $$\lambda_i \left(v - \alpha \sum_{j=1}^{N} \hat{u}_{ij}\right) = \frac{1}{m}(v - \alpha c_i) = \frac{1}{m}(v - \alpha\frac{v}{\alpha}) = 0$$

   and observe that (28) is fulfilled as well.

2. Let us now show that (OPT2) and (29) hold for $\widehat{U}$:

   a) In case that $j = J(i)$ holds, we obtain $\hat{u}_{ij} = c_i$ and $\mu_{iJ(i)} = 0$. Thus (29) is obviously fulfilled. The other case, i.e. $j \neq J(i)$, yields $\hat{u}_{ij} = 0$ and $\mu_{ij} = (\alpha\lambda_i + \beta)\left(1 - \sum_{k=1}^{T} b_{kJ(i)} b_{kj}\right)$. Since (31) has to hold, we obtain $\mu_{ij} \geq 0$ and we observe that in this case (29) is fulfilled as well.

   b) Let again be $j = J(i)$. Then we obtain

$$\alpha\lambda_i + \beta - \sum_{l=1}^{L}\sum_{k=1}^{T} \eta_{lk} a_{li} b_{kJ(i)} = \left(1 - \sum_{k=1}^{T} b_{kJ(i)}^2\right)(\alpha\lambda_i + \beta) = 0$$

   by using the definitions of η and μ and the scaling condition (31). In this case (OPT2) is fulfilled.
   Let us now consider $j \neq J(i)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\alpha\lambda_i + \beta - \sum_{l=1}^{L}\sum_{k=1}^{T} \eta_{lk} a_{li} b_{kJ(i)} - \mu_{ij} \\ &= \alpha\lambda_i + \beta - \sum_{l=1}^{L}\sum_{k=1}^{T} \eta_{lk} a_{li} b_{kJ(i)} - (\alpha\lambda_i + \beta)\left(1 - \sum_{k=1}^{T} b_{kJ(i)} b_{kj}\right) \\ &= 0\,, \end{aligned}$$

   where we use the definition of μ. Thus we see that in this case (OPT2) is fulfilled as well.

In summary, we see that there exist Lagrange parameters such that $\widehat{U}$ fulfills the optimality conditions and complementary conditions of (26). Thus we obtain the assertion. □

All in all, we found a condition for exact recovery of solutions of the constrained $\ell^{0,\infty}$-problem, which contain 1-sparse rows, using the constrained problem (26) for the reconstruction, i.e. (31) has to hold.

Remark 6.
We need to assume that A^T is surjective in order to solve (32)*. Unfortunately, if A^T is surjective, then A is injective and thus we could easier consider $UB^T = A^\dagger W$, where $A^\dagger$ is the pseudoinverse of A.*

Let us now consider an example of the extremest under-determined case, i.e. where we have $L = 1$.

Theorem 12.
Let be $\beta = 0$ and $A \in \mathbb{R}^{1\times M}$ with $M > 1$ and $a_i \neq 0$ for every $i \in \{1, \ldots, M\}$. Let

$$\hat{u}_{ij} = \begin{cases} c_i & \text{if } j = J(i)\,, \\ 0 & \text{if } j \neq J(i)\,, \end{cases}$$

be the exact solution of the nonnegative $\ell^{0,\infty}$-problem (30) *with $J : \{1, ..., M\} \longrightarrow \{1, ..., N\}$, $i \longmapsto J(i)$ mapping again every index i to the index of the corresponding basis vector, where the coefficient is unequal to zero. Furthermore, let $m \in \{1, \ldots, M\}$ be a row-index, where $\widehat{U}$*

reaches its maximum, i.e. we have $c_m = \max\limits_{p\in\{1,\dots,M\}} c_p = \frac{v}{\alpha}$.

In case the exact solution $\widehat{U}$ *contains a row-vector* u_i*, which has its nonzero entry at the same position as* u_m*, i.e.* $J(i) = J(m)$*, but their entries differ, i.e.* $c_i < c_m$*, then exact recovery of* $\widehat{U}$ *using the nonnegative* $\ell^{1,\infty}$*-problem* (26) *for the reconstruction is not possible.*

Proof.
Let us suppose exact recovery were possible. Then there exist a λ, which fulfills (OPT1) and (28), a μ, which fulfills (29) and an η such that (OPT2) is fulfilled.
By considering the complementary condition (28) for $i \in \left\{1,\dots,M \;\middle|\; c_i < \max\limits_{p\in\{1,\dots,M\}} c_p\right\}$, we have

$$0 = \lambda_i \left(v - \alpha \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij} \right) = \lambda_i \left(v - \alpha u_{iJ(i)} \right) = \lambda_i \underbrace{(v - \alpha c_i)}_{\neq 0} ,$$

since it is $c_i < \frac{v}{\alpha}$. Thus $\lambda_i = 0$ holds for every $i \in \left\{1,\dots,M \;\middle|\; c_i < \max\limits_{p\in\{1,\dots,M\}} c_p\right\}$. On the other hand with (OPT1) we have

$$1 = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \lambda_i = \sum_{\substack{m\in\{1,\dots,M| \\ c_m = \max_p c_p\}}} \lambda_m ,$$

which yields $\lambda_m > 0$ for every $m \in \left\{1,\dots,M \;\middle|\; c_m = \max\limits_{p\in\{1,\dots,M\}} c_p\right\}$.
Now let us consider (OPT2) for $j = J(i)$ and $j = J(m)$, which then reads as follows:

$$\sum_{k=1}^{T} \eta_k b_{kJ(m)} = \alpha \frac{\lambda_i}{a_i} \qquad \text{and}$$
$$\sum_{k=1}^{T} \eta_k b_{kJ(m)} = \alpha \frac{\lambda_m}{a_m} ,$$

since we have $J(i) = J(m)$. Therefore, we obtain

$$a_m \lambda_i = a_i \lambda_m .$$

This is a contradiction, since we have $\lambda_i = 0$, $\lambda_m > 0$ and a_i and a_m are unequal to zero.
Thus we observe that the 1-sparse $\ell^{0,\infty}$-solution $\hat{u}_{ij}$ cannot be the solution of the $\ell^{1,\infty}$-problem (26) and in this case exact recovery is not possible. □

Remark 7.
In the case of Theorem 12 there always exists a solution of (26) *and* (30)*, which has a nonzero element in just one row, i.e.* $\widehat{U}$ *itself is 1-sparse.*

Note that Theorem 12 does not state that the reconstructed support is wrong. Hence we could still obtain important information from the nonnegative $\ell^{1,\infty}$-reconstruction.
Furthermore, Theorem 12 does not apply for the case where we have $\beta > 0$, since in this case we obtain

$$(\alpha\lambda_i + \beta)a_m = (\alpha\lambda_m + \beta)a_i$$

and thus we do not obtain a contradiction in the last step of the proof. Thus Theorem 12 suggests the usage of $\beta > 0$.

4 Algorithms

The numerical minimization of $\ell^{p,q}$-related regularization problems is usually done by using a modified FOCUSS algorithm (cf. [40, 12]) if the problem includes an exact reconstruction, or in the noisy case a thresholded Landweber iteration (both realizations may be found in [37]). However, those algorithms are designed for $0 < p, q \leq 2$ and since in our case we have $q = \infty$, they are not suitable for minimizing $\ell^{1,\infty}$-related problems.

In order to solve problem (4) numerically, we use a different approach and develop an algorithm for the solution of its reformulated problem, i. e.

$$\min_{U} \ \frac{1}{2} \left\| AUB^T - W \right\|_F^2 + \beta \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij} \ \text{ s. t. } \ \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij} \leq \tilde{v}, \ \forall\, i, \ u_{ij} \geq 0 \quad \forall\, i, j \ . \tag{19}$$

For the sake of simplicity we exclude the weight γ for now.

For the numerical solution of this problem, we use the alternate direction method of multipliers (ADMM), which traces back to the works of Glowinski and Tallec [28] and Gabay and Mercier [27]. It was furthermore subject of many other books and papers, including [22], especially its chapters [23] and [26], as well as [29], [54], [25], [16] and [10]. For the computation of reasonably simple sub-steps, we split the problem twice. In so doing we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{U,\, Z,\, D} \ \frac{1}{2} \left\| AZ - W \right\|_F^2 + \beta \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{j=1}^{N} d_{ij} \ \text{ s. t. } \ & \sum_{j=1}^{N} d_{ij} \leq \tilde{v}, \ \forall i, \ d_{ij} \geq 0 \ \forall i, j \\ & Z = UB^T, \ D = U \ . \end{aligned}$$

By using the Lagrange functional

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}\left(U, D, Z; \widetilde{P}, \widetilde{Q}\right) = \frac{1}{2} \left\| AZ - W \right\|_F^2 + \beta \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{j=1}^{N} d_{ij} + \left\langle \widetilde{P}, U - D \right\rangle_F + \left\langle \widetilde{Q}, UB^T - Z \right\rangle_F \\ \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{j=1}^{N} d_{ij} \leq \tilde{v}, \ \forall i, \ d_{ij} \geq 0 \ \forall i, j \ , \end{aligned}$$

where $\widetilde{P}$ and $\widetilde{Q}$ are the dual variables, we obtain the *unscaled* augmented Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{un}^{\lambda,\mu}\left(U, D, Z; \widetilde{P}, \widetilde{Q}\right) = \frac{1}{2} \left\| AZ - W \right\|_F^2 + \beta \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{j=1}^{N} d_{ij} + \left\langle \widetilde{P}, U - D \right\rangle_F \\ + \frac{\lambda}{2} \left\| U - D \right\|_F^2 + \left\langle \widetilde{Q}, UB^T - Z \right\rangle_F + \frac{\mu}{2} \left\| UB^T - Z \right\|_F^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{j=1}^{N} d_{ij} \leq \tilde{v}, \ \forall i, \ d_{ij} \geq 0 \ \forall i, j \ , \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

with Lagrange parameters λ, μ. Since its handling is much easier we also want to state the *scaled* augmented Lagrangian, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{sc}^{\lambda,\mu}(U, D, Z; P, Q) = \frac{1}{2} \left\| AZ - W \right\|_F^2 + \beta \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{j=1}^{N} d_{ij} + \frac{\lambda}{2} \left\| U - D + P \right\|_F^2 \\ + \frac{\mu}{2} \left\| UB^T - Z + Q \right\|_F^2 \ \text{ s. t. } \ \sum_{j=1}^{N} d_{ij} \leq \tilde{v}, \ \forall i, \ d_{ij} \geq 0 \ \forall i, j \ , \end{aligned}$$

with the new scaled dual variables $P := \frac{\widetilde{P}}{\lambda}$ and $Q := \frac{\widetilde{Q}}{\mu}$. By using ADMM the algorithm reads as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
U^{k+1} &= \underset{U}{\operatorname{argmin}}\, \mathcal{L}_{sc}^{\lambda,\mu}(U, Z^k, D^k; P^k, Q^k) \\
D^{k+1} &= \underset{D}{\operatorname{argmin}}\, \mathcal{L}_{sc}^{\lambda,\mu}(U^{k+1}, Z^k, D; P^k, Q^k) \\
Z^{k+1} &= \underset{Z}{\operatorname{argmin}}\, \mathcal{L}_{sc}^{\lambda,\mu}(U^{k+1}, Z, D^{k+1}; P^k, Q^k) \\
P^{k+1} &= P^k - \left(D^{k+1} - U^{k+1}\right) \\
Q^{k+1} &= Q^k - \left(Z^{k+1} - U^{k+1}B^T\right)
\end{aligned}$$

For faster convergence we use a standard extension of ADMM in Subsection 4.3, i.e. an adaptive parameter choice as proposed in [5, Subsection 3.4.1] with its derivation in [5, Section 3.3], which we will adapt to our problem. Another advantage of this extension is that the performance becomes less dependent on the initial choice of the penalty parameter. In order to do so, we first propose the optimality conditions.

4.1 Optimality Conditions

We obtain the following primal feasibility conditions

$$0 = \partial_P \mathcal{L} = \lambda\,(U - D) \tag{34}$$
$$0 = \partial_Q \mathcal{L} = \mu\left(UB^T - Z\right) \tag{35}$$

and the dual feasibility conditions

$$0 = \partial_U \mathcal{L} = \lambda P + \mu Q B \tag{36}$$
$$0 \in \partial_D \mathcal{L} = \beta \mathbb{1}_{m\times n} - \lambda P + \partial J(D) \tag{37}$$
$$0 = \partial_Z \mathcal{L} = A^T\,(AZ - W) - \mu Q \tag{38}$$

with

$$J(D) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \sum_{j=1}^{N} d_{ij} \le \tilde{v}\ \forall i,\ d_{ij} \ge 0\ \forall i,j\ , \\ \infty & \text{else.} \end{cases} \tag{39}$$

Since U^{k+1} minimizes $\mathcal{L}_{sc}^{\lambda,\mu}(U, Z^k, D^k; P^k, Q^k)$ by definition, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
0 \in \partial_U \mathcal{L}_{sc}^{\lambda,\mu} &= \lambda\left(U^{k+1} - D^k + P^k\right) + \mu\left(U^{k+1}B^T - Z^k + Q^k\right)B \\
&= \lambda P^{k+1} + \lambda\left(D^{k+1} - D^k\right) + \mu Q^{k+1}B + \mu\left(Z^{k+1} - Z^k\right)B\ ,
\end{aligned}$$

by using the definitions of P^{k+1} and Q^{k+1}. This is equivalent to

$$\lambda\left(D^k - D^{k+1}\right) + \mu\left(Z^k - Z^{k+1}\right)B \in \lambda P^{k+1} + \mu Q^{k+1}B\ ,$$

where the right hand side is the first dual feasibility condition (36). Therefore

$$S^{k+1} = \lambda\left(D^k - D^{k+1}\right) + \mu\left(Z^k - Z^{k+1}\right)B \tag{40}$$

can be seen as a dual residual for (36). Analogically we consider $0 \in \partial_D \mathcal{L}_{sc}^{\lambda,\mu}$, which yields that P^{k+1} and D^{k+1} always satisfy (37). The same applies for $0 \in \partial_Z \mathcal{L}_{sc}^{\lambda,\mu}$, where we see that Q^{k+1} and Z^{k+1} always satisfy (38). In addition we will refer to

$$R_1^{k+1} = \lambda \left(D^{k+1} - U^{k+1} \right) \qquad \text{and} \tag{41}$$

$$R_2^{k+1} = \mu \left(Z^{k+1} - U^{k+1} B^T \right) \tag{42}$$

as the primal residuals at iteration $k+1$.

Obviously we obtain five optimality conditions (34 - 38). We have seen that (37) and (38) are always satisfied. The other three (34 - 36) lead to the primal residuals (41) and (42) and to the dual residual (40), which converge to zero as ADMM proceeds (cp. [5, Appendix A, p. 106 et seqq.]).

4.2 Stopping Criteria

In analogy to [5, Section 3.3.1] we derive the stopping criteria for the algorithm. As shown in Appendix C the primal and dual residuals can be related to a bound on the objective suboptimality of the current point Y^*. Hence we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2} \|AZ - W\|_F^2 + \beta \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{j=1}^{N} d_{ij} + J(D) - Y^* \\ \leq &\left\langle P^k, R_1^k \right\rangle_F + \left\langle Q^k, R_2^k \right\rangle_F + \left\langle U^k - U^*, S^k \right\rangle_F . \end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

We see that the residuals should be small in order to obtain small objective suboptimality. Since we want to obtain a stopping criterion but U^* is unknown, we estimate that $\|U^k - U^*\|_F \leq d$ shall hold. Thus we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2} \|AZ - W\|_F^2 + \beta \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{j=1}^{N} d_{ij} + J(D) - Y^* \\ \leq &\|P^k\|_F \|R_1^k\|_F + \|Q^k\|_F \|R_2^k\|_F + d \|S^k\|_F . \end{aligned}$$

It stands to reason that the primal and dual residual must be small, i.e.

$$\|R_1^k\|_F \leq \varepsilon_1^{\text{pri}} , \qquad \|R_2^k\|_F \leq \varepsilon_2^{\text{pri}} , \qquad \|S^k\|_F \leq \varepsilon^{\text{dual}} ,$$

with tolerances $\varepsilon_{1,2}^{\text{pri}} > 0$ and $\varepsilon^{\text{dual}} > 0$ for the feasibility conditions (34 - 36), respectively. Boyd et al suggest in [5] that those can be chosen via an absolute and relative criterion, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_1^{\text{pri}} &= \sqrt{MN}\, \varepsilon^{\text{abs}} + \varepsilon^{\text{rel}} \max \left\{ \|U^k\|_F, \|D^k\|_F, 0 \right\} , \\ \varepsilon_2^{\text{pri}} &= \sqrt{MT}\, \varepsilon^{\text{abs}} + \varepsilon^{\text{rel}} \max \left\{ \|U^k B^T\|_F, \|Z^k\|_F, 0 \right\} , \\ \varepsilon^{\text{dual}} &= \sqrt{MN}\, \varepsilon^{\text{abs}} + \varepsilon^{\text{rel}} \|\lambda P^k + \mu Q^k B\|_F , \end{aligned}$$

where $\varepsilon^{\text{rel}} = 10^{-3}$ or 10^{-4} is a relative tolerance and the absolute tolerance ε^{abs} depends on the scale of the typical variable values. Note that the factors $\sqrt{MN}$ and $\sqrt{MT}$ result from the fact that the Frobenius norms are in $\mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$ and $\mathbb{R}^{M \times T}$, respectively.

4.3 Adaptive Parameter Choice

In order to extend the standard ADMM and to improve its convergence rate, we vary the penalty parameters λ^k and μ^k in each iteration as proposed in [5, Section 3.4.1]. This extension has been analyzed in [42] in the context of the method of multipliers. There it has been shown that if the penalty parameters go to infinity, superlinear convergence may be reached. If we consider λ and μ to become fixed after a finite number of iterations, the fixed penalty parameter theory still applies, i.e. we obtain convergence of the ADMM.

The following scheme is amongst others proposed in [32],[56] and often works well.

$$\lambda^{k+1} = \begin{cases} \tau_1^{\text{incr}} \lambda^k & \text{if } \|R_1^k\|_F > \eta_1 \|S^k\|_F, \\ \frac{\lambda^k}{\tau_1^{\text{decr}}} & \text{if } \|S^k\|_F > \eta_1 \|R_1^k\|_F, \\ \lambda^k & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad P^{k+1} = \begin{cases} \frac{P^k}{\tau_1^{\text{incr}}} & \text{if } \|R_1^k\|_F > \eta_1 \|S^k\|_F, \\ P^k \tau_1^{\text{decr}} & \text{if } \|S^k\|_F > \eta_1 \|R_1^k\|_F, \\ P^k & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$\mu^{k+1} := \begin{cases} \tau_2^{\text{incr}} \mu^k & \text{if } \|R_2^k\|_F > \eta_2 \|S^k\|_F, \\ \frac{\mu^k}{\tau_2^{\text{decr}}} & \text{if } \|S^k\|_F > \eta_2 \|R_1^k\|_F, \\ \mu^k & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad Q^{k+1} = \begin{cases} \frac{Q^k}{\tau_2^{\text{incr}}} & \text{if } \|R_2^k\|_F > \eta_2 \|S^k\|_F, \\ Q^k \tau_2^{\text{decr}} & \text{if } \|S^k\|_F > \eta_2 \|R_2^k\|_F, \\ Q^k & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $\eta_{1,2} > 1$, $\tau_{1,2}^{\text{incr}} > 1$, $\tau_{1,2}^{\text{decr}} > 1$. Typical choices are $\eta_{1,2} = 10$ and $\tau_{1,2}^{\text{incr}} = \tau_{1,2}^{\text{decr}} = 2$. Note that the dual variables P^k and Q^k only have to be updated in the scaled form.

4.4 Solving the $\ell^{1,\infty} - \ell^{1,1}$-Regularized Problem

Algorithm 1 $\ell^{1,\infty}$-ℓ^1-regularized Problem via ADMM with Double Splitting

Parameters: $v > 0,\ \beta > 0,\ A \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times M},\ B \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times N}, W \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times T},\ \eta_{1,2} > 1,\ \tau_{1,2}^{\text{incr}} > 1,\ \tau_{1,2}^{\text{decr}} > 1,\ \varepsilon^{\text{rel}} = 10^{-3}$ or $10^{-4},\ \varepsilon^{\text{abs}} > 0$

Initialization: $U, Z, D, P, Q, S, R_1, R_2 \equiv 0,\ \varepsilon_1^{\text{pri}} = \sqrt{MN}\,\varepsilon^{\text{abs}}, \varepsilon_2^{\text{pri}} = \sqrt{MT}\,\varepsilon^{\text{abs}},$

$\varepsilon^{\text{dual}} = \sqrt{MN}\,\varepsilon^{\text{abs}}$

while $\|R_1\|_F > \varepsilon_1^{\text{pri}}$ **and** $\|R_2\|_F > \varepsilon_2^{\text{pri}}$ **and** $\|S\|_F > \varepsilon^{\text{dual}}$ **do**

$D^{\text{old}} = D;$

$Z^{\text{old}} = Z;$

▷ Main Part

$U = \left(\lambda\,(D - P) + \mu\,(Z - Q)\,B\right)\left(\lambda I + \mu B^T B\right)^{-1};$

$D = \underset{D \in G}{\operatorname{argmin}}\ \frac{\lambda}{2}\,\|D - U + P\|_F^2 + \beta \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{j=1}^{N} d_{ij} \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{j=1}^{N} d_{ij} \le v\ \forall i;$ ▷ see Appendix B

$Z = \left(A^T A + \mu I\right)^{-1}\left(A^T W + \mu\left(U B^T + Q\right)\right);$

▷ Update Residuals

$S = \lambda\left(D^{\text{old}} - D\right) + \mu\left(Z^{\text{old}} - Z\right)B;$

$R_1 = \lambda\,(D - U);$

$R_2 = \mu\left(Z - U B^T\right);$

▷ Lagrange Updates

$P = P - (D - U);$

$Q = Q - \left(Z - U B^T\right);$

▷ Varying Penalty/Lagrange Parameters

if $\|R_1\|_F > \eta_1 \|S\|_F$ **then**
  $\lambda = \lambda \tau_1^{\text{incr}}$;
  $P = \frac{P}{\tau_1^{\text{incr}}}$;
else if $\|S\|_F > \eta_1 \|R_1\|_F$ **then**
  $\lambda = \frac{\lambda}{\tau_1^{\text{decr}}}$;
  $P = P \tau_1^{\text{decr}}$;
end if
if $\|R_2\|_F > \eta_2 \|S\|_F$ **then**
  $\mu = \mu \tau_2^{\text{incr}}$;
  $Q = \frac{Q}{\tau_2^{\text{incr}}}$;
else if $\|S\|_F > \eta_2 \|R_2\|_F$ **then**
  $\mu = \frac{\mu}{\tau_2^{\text{decr}}}$;
  $Q = Q \tau_2^{\text{decr}}$;
end if

▷ Stopping Criteria

$\varepsilon_1^{\text{pri}} = \sqrt{MN}\, \varepsilon^{\text{abs}} + \varepsilon^{\text{rel}} \max\left\{\|U^k\|_F, \|D^k\|_F, 0\right\}$;
$\varepsilon_2^{\text{pri}} = \sqrt{MT}\, \varepsilon^{\text{abs}} + \varepsilon^{\text{rel}} \max\left\{\|U^k B^T\|_F, \|Z^k\|_F, 0\right\}$;
$\varepsilon^{\text{dual}} = \sqrt{MN}\, \varepsilon^{\text{abs}} + \varepsilon^{\text{rel}} \|\lambda P^k + \mu Q^k B\|_F$;
end while
return U ▷ Solution of (19)

5 Computational Experiments

In the last sections we have analyzed $\ell^{1,\infty}$-regularized variational models and its reformulations. Moreover, we have deduced an algorithm for the computation of a solution for the $\ell^{1,\infty}$-regularized minimization problem.
In this section we propose dynamic positron emission tomography for the visualization of myocardial perfusion as a possible application. To incorporate knowledge about this application, we include *kinetic modeling* in order to model the blood flow and tracer exchange in the heart muscle. After an introduction to the corresponding medical and mathematical background, we show some results for synthetic examples and discuss the quality of our approach.

5.1 Application to Dynamic Positron Emission Tomography

Positron Emission Tomography (PET) is an imaging technique used in nuclear medicine that visualizes the distribution of a radioactive tracer, which was applied to the patient. Compared to computer tomography (CT), PET has the advantage of being a functional rather than a morphological imaging technique.

By using radioactive water ($H_2^{15}O$) as a tracer, it is possible to visualize blood flow. $H_2^{15}O$ has the advantage of being highly diffusible and the radiation exposure is low. Even dynamic images are possible. On the other hand the reconstructed images have poor quality due to the short radioactive half-life of $H_2^{15}O$.

Now let us consider the inverse problem of dynamic PET, i.e.

$$\mathcal{A}Z = W\ , \tag{44}$$

where the operator $\mathcal{A}$ linking the dynamic image Z with the measured data W is usually the *Radon operator*, but could also be another operator depending on the application.

By using kinetic modeling (cf. [58, Chapter 23, p. 499 et seqq.]) we are able to describe the unknown image Z as the tracer concentration in the tissue C_T, i.e.

$$C_T(x,t) = F(x) \int_0^t C_A(\tau) e^{-\frac{F(x)}{\lambda}(t-\tau)} \, \mathrm{d}\tau \, , \tag{45}$$

where $C_A(\tau)$ is the arterial tracer concentration, also known as input curve, $F(x)$ refers to the perfusion and λ is the ratio between the tracer concentration in tissue and the venous tracer concentration resulting from Fick's principle.



Figure 2: Illustration of kinetic modeling

Kinetic modeling describes the tracer exchange with the tissue in the capillaries. The tracer is injected and flows from the arteries with concentration C_A to the veins with concentration C_V. While passing the capillaries between arteries and veins, a part of it moves across the vascular wall with flux J_T into the tissue, cf. Figure 2.

Expression (45) is an integral equation including the exponential factor $e^{-\frac{F(x)}{\lambda}(t-\tau)}$, which depends on both input arguments, i.e. time t and space x. This expression is highly nonlinear and thus not easy to handle especially in combination with inverse problems. Due to the fact that we have prior knowledge about $\frac{F(x)}{\lambda}$, i.e. that its value lies within certain parameters, we are able to provide a big pool of given perfusion values for this expression, which we denote by $\tilde{b}_j$. Subsequently, we are able to consider a linearization, i.e.

$$\mathcal{B}(u, C_A) := \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_j(x) \underbrace{\int_0^t C_A(\tau) e^{-\tilde{b}_j(t-\tau)} \, \mathrm{d}\tau}_{b_j(t)} \, , \tag{46}$$

where $u_j(x)$ shall denote an approximation to the perfusion value $F(x)$ corresponding to $\tilde{b}_j$. Note that the integral is now independent of space. Expression (46) is reasonable if there is at most one $u_j \neq 0$ for $j \in \{1, ..., N\}$, i.e. the coefficient u_j corresponding to the correct perfusion value $\tilde{b}_j$. In order to further simplify the work with this operator, we assume that the input curve C_A is predetermined.

Hereby we obtain the linear kinetic modeling operator

$$\mathcal{B}(u) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_j(x) b_j(t) \, , \tag{47}$$

which we use to describe the unknown image Z. The advantage of (47) over (45) is that we are able to compute the basis functions $b_j(t)$ in advance and thus we can provide many of

those for the reconstruction.
Note that there exists another deduction of (47) by [41].

By considering a discretization of (47), we obtain

$$\left(UB^T\right)_{ik} = \sum_{j=1}^{N} u_{ij} b_{kj} \ , \tag{48}$$

where $i \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ denotes the pixel and $k \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ the time step. After discretizing $\mathcal{A}$ as well, we can insert (48) for the image Z in (44) and obtain

$$AUB^T = W \ . \tag{49}$$

Hence (10) can be used for the reconstruction of the discretized coefficients u_{ij}.

5.2 Results

In this section we present some numerical results. We are going to work on synthetic data to investigate the effectiveness of the approach. In order to do so, we use a simple 3D matrix $\widehat{U}$ containing the exact coefficients as ground truth, i.e. two spatial dimensions $M := m_1 m_2$ and one extra dimension referring to the number of basis vectors N. Defining two regions, where for only one basis vector the coefficients are nonzero, yields the fact that the corresponding coefficients for most of the basis vectors are zero. Obviously our ground truth fulfills the prior knowledge, which we would like to promote in the reconstruction, i.e. there is only one coefficient per pixel, which is unequal to zero.



Figure 3: Ground truth $\widehat{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{200 \times 200 \times 8}$ with 200^2 pixels and 8 basis vectors

In Figure 3 we see that the exact coefficients for the most basis vectors are zero. Only some coefficients corresponding to the second and seventh basis vectors are nonzero. In order to obtain the artificial data $W \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times T}$, we have to apply the matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times M}$ and $B^T \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times T}$ to the ground truth $\widehat{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}$.



Figure 4: Kinetic modeling basis vectors B^T

As an example for B we use kinetic modeling basis vectors as they are used in dynamic positron emission tomography (cf. Section 5.1 and [58, Chapter 23]), which are basically discretized exponential functions with different parameters. In Figure 4 we observe that those basis vectors are very similar, i.e. the mutual incoherence parameter (cf. (24)) is large. For the verification of our approach including local sparsity, we use a simple 2D convolution in space for the matrix A as a simplification. In future work, however, the Radon operator shall be used instead.

By using Algorithm 1 on the so computed data W including a strong $\ell^{1,\infty}$-regularization, i.e. $\tilde{v} = 0.1$, we obtain a very good reconstruction of the support.



Figure 5: 2nd, 6th and 7th reconstructed coefficient matrices using $\tilde{v} = 0.01$ and $\beta = 0.1$

Figure 5 only shows the coefficient matrices to those basis vectors, which include reconstructed nonzero coefficients. For simplicity we do not show the other reconstructed coefficient matrices, which are completely zero. Obviously we obtain a very good reconstruction of the support. Only a few coefficients, which actually correspond to the seventh basis vector (dark brown), are reconstructed wrongly and show up in the sixth basis vector (light green). This is due to the coherence of the basis vectors, i.e. the sixth (light green) and the seventh (dark brown) basis vector are very similar, compare for instance Figure 4.

We observe that every value larger than $\tilde{v}$ is projected down to $\tilde{v}$ and we make a systematic error. This is due to the inequality constraint in problem (19) and because of the fact that we chose $\tilde{v}$ smaller than the maximal value of the exact data $\widehat{U}$ (compare for instance Subsection 2.4 and especially Theorem 7). Thus we are not really close to the exact data. In order to overcome this problem, we first reconstruct the support including the $\ell^{1,\infty}$- and $\ell^{1,1}$-regularization and then perform a second run without regularization *only on the known support* to reduce the distance to the exact data.



Figure 6: 2nd, 6th and 7th reconstructed coefficient matrix using $\tilde{v} = 0.01$ and $\beta = 0.1$ including a second run only on the support; the other coefficient matrices are completely zero

In Figure 6 we see that this approach leads to very good results.

We additionally reconstructed an example including some Gaussian noise. In Figure 7 we observe that the algorithm performs quite nicely.



Figure 7: Reconstruction using $\tilde{v} = 0.01$ and $\beta = 0.1$ including Gaussian noise with standard deviation $\sigma = 0.01$

Let us now evaluate Algorithm 1 with respect to the quality of the reconstructed support. In order to do so, we compare the reconstructed support after the first run (including both regularizations) with the support of our ground truth and state how much percent of the

true support is reconstructed wrongly depending on the $\ell^{1,\infty}$-regularization parameter $\tilde{v}$. We also include the distance of the wrongly picked basis vector in each pixel, for instance if the support of the ground truth picks basis vector number 7 and the reconstructed support picks basis vector number 5 instead, we double the influence of the error in this pixel if the reconstructed support picks basis vector number 4 instead of the correct number 7 we triple it and so on.

$\tilde{v}$	Percentage of wrong pixel	Number of iterations
10^{-1}	0.6722 %	262
10^{-2}	0.1772 %	350
10^{-3}	0.1772 %	431
10^{-4}	0.1772 %	512
10^{-5}	0.1772 %	592
10^{-6}	0.1772 %	663
10^{-7}	0.1772 %	672

Table 1: Evaluation of Algorithm 1 with $\beta = 0.1$, $\lambda = 0.5$ and $\mu = 0.1$

In Table 1 we see the evaluation of Algorithm 1 applied to the noiseless data W. When $\tilde{v}$ becomes smaller than 0.01 we observe that there is no further improvement. As we have seen in Figure 5 the boundary of the region is reconstructed wrongly and the algorithm selects the sixth instead of the seventh basis function. However, the prior knowledge is already fulfilled, i.e. in every pixel there is only one basis vector active. This is the reason why there are still 0.1772% wrongly reconstructed pixel and we do not obtain further improvement cannot be achieved.

$\tilde{v}$	Percentage of wrong pixel	Number of iterations
10^{-1}	3.6997 %	262
10^{-2}	0.2628 %	350
10^{-3}	0.1991 %	431
10^{-4}	0.1875 %	512
10^{-5}	0.1897 %	592
10^{-6}	0.1925 %	663
10^{-7}	0.1859 %	672

Table 2: Evaluation of Algorithm 1 with $\beta = 0.1$, $\lambda = 0.5$ and $\mu = 0.1$ including Gaussian noise with standard deviation $\sigma = 0.01$

In Table 2 and 3 we have the same error measures for different values of $\tilde{v}$ as in Table 1. However, this time we included Gaussian noise on the data W with standard deviation 0.01, 0.05 respectively. At first the error drops quickly. However, when $\tilde{v}$ becomes smaller the error stagnates in a certain range similar to the noise-free case.

In order to smartly choose $\tilde{v}$, we have to find a good tradeoff between a small error and a small number of iterations. Choosing $\tilde{v} \in \left[10^{-4}, \ldots, 10^{-3}\right]$ seems to be a good choice.

$\tilde{v}$	Percentage of wrong pixel	Number of iterations
10^{-1}	6.4534 %	262
10^{-2}	1.5500 %	350
10^{-3}	1.0353 %	431
10^{-4}	1.0084 %	512
10^{-5}	0.9725 %	592
10^{-6}	1.0044 %	663
10^{-7}	0.9625 %	672

Table 3: Evaluation of Algorithm 1 with $\beta = 0.1$, $\lambda = 0.5$ and $\mu = 0.1$ including Gaussian noise with standard deviation $\sigma = 0.05$

6 Conclusions

For the solution of inverse problems, where the unknown is considered to be a matrix, mixed $\ell^{p,q}$-norms can be used as regularization functionals in order to promote certain structures in the reconstructed matrix. Motivated by dynamic positron emission tomography for myocardial perfusion, we proposed a novel variational model for a dictionary based matrix completion problem incorporating local sparsity via $\ell^{1,\infty}$-regularization as an alternative to the more commonly considered joint sparsity model [21, 47]. We not only analyzed the existence and potential uniqueness of a solution, but also investigated the subdifferential of the $\ell^{1,\infty}$-functional and a source condition. One of the main results of this paper consists of the deduction of an equivalent formulation, which not only simplifies the analysis of the problem, but also facilitates its numerical implementation. Moreover, we discussed exact recovery for locally 1-sparse solutions by analyzing the noise-free case, in which we considered the minimization of the nonnegative $\ell^{1,\infty}$-functional with an equality constraint in the data fidelity term. As a result of this analysis, we discovered that the dictionary matrix has to be normalized in a certain way in order to exactly reconstruct locally 1-sparse data under simplified conditions.

In this paper, a novel implementation of the problem was developed that relies on a double splitting via the alternating direction method of multipliers (ADMM). The algorithm yields superior results, in particular an almost exact recovery of the true support of the solution. Nevertheless, one drawback of the reformulation of the problem we introduced is that the results are not very close to the true solution. However, having a good estimate of the support of the solution allows us to refine our first result by solving the inverse problem restricted to the previously recovered support with no further regularization. This second result shows promising features, even in the presence of Gaussian noise.

However, for some coefficients at the boundary of the exact nonzero region the algorithm still picked the wrong basis vector. In order to overcome this problem and to further improve the results, one can add a total variation term to the variational regularization scheme, as we did in [33]. Due to the additional regularization, which was not discussed in this paper, the choice of a good combination of regularization parameters is challenging, however, the results are promising. By including total variation on the coefficient matrices, the reconstructions improve even more and better results can be recovered.

In summary, the results obtained by our approach even without using total variation are very satisfactory and could be even improved by incorporating an additional total variation regularization on the coefficient matrices. Our results motivate to investigate the model further, especially in combination with a total variation regularization, which moreover makes

the algorithm more robust to noise. Further research on parameter choice rules may eventually turn the approach including total variation into an effective reconstruction scheme for practical applications.

References

[1] F. Bach, R. Jenatton, J. Mairal, and G. Obozinski. Convex optimization with sparsity-inducing norms. In S. Sra, S. Nowozin, and S. J. Wright, editors, *Optimization for Machine Learning*. MIT Press, 2011. 1

[2] F. Bach, R. Jenatton, J. Mairal, and G. Obozinski. Optimization with sparsity-inducing penalties. *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, 4(1):1–106, 2012. 1

[3] F. Bach, R. Jenatton, J. Mairal, and G. Obozinski. Structured sparsity through convex optimization. *Statistical Science*, 27(4):450–468, 2012. 1

[4] J. M. Bioucas-Dias, A. Plaza, N. Dobigeon, M. Parente, Q. Du, P. Gader, and J. Chanussot. Hyperspectral unmixing overview: Geometrical, statistical, and sparse regression-based approaches. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing*, 5(2):354–379, April 2012. 2

[5] S. Boyd, N. Parikh, E. Chu, B. Peleato, and J. Eckstein. Distributed optimization and statistical learning via the alternating direction method of multipliers. *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, 3(1):1–122, 2010. 27, 28, 29, 45

[6] M. Burger and S. Osher. Convergence rates of convex variational regularization. *Inverse problems*, 20(5):1411, 2004. 12, 14

[7] E. J. Candès, X. Li, Y. Ma, and J. Wrigh. Robust principal component analysis? *Journal of the ACM*, 58(3), 2011. 12

[8] E. J. Candès and Y. Plan. A probabilistic and ripless theory of compressed sensing. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 57(11):7235–7254, 2010. 12

[9] E. J. Candès and T. Tao. Decoding by linear programming. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 51(12):4203 – 4215, December 2005. 1, 12

[10] G. Chen and M. Teboulle. A proximal-based decomposition method for convex minimization problems. *Mathematical Programming*, 64:81–101, 1994. 26

[11] A. Cohen, W. Dahmen, and R. Devore. Compressed sensing and best k-term approximation. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 22:211–231, 2009. 1, 12

[12] S. Cotter, B. Rao, K. Engan, and K. Kreutz-Delgado. Sparse solutions to linear inverse problems with multiple measurement vectors. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 53(7):2477–2488, 2005. 26

[13] S. M. Kakade D. Hsu and T. Zhang. Robust matrix decomposition with sparse corruptions. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 57:7221–7234, 2011. 12

[14] D. L. Donoho and X. Huo. Uncertainty principles and ideal atomic decomposition. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 47(7):2845–2862, November 2001. 1, 12

[15] J. Duchi, S. Shalev-Shwartz, Y. Singer, and T. Chandra. Efficient projections onto the l1-ball for learning in high dimensions. *Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2008. 45

[16] J. Eckstein and M. Fukushima. Some reformulations and applications of the alternating direction method of multipliers. *Large Scale Optimization: State of the Art*, pages 119–138, 1993. 26

[17] I. Ekeland and R. Témam. *Convex Analysis and Variational Problems*. SIAM, corrected reprint edition, 1999. 11

[18] D. Elson, S. Webb, J. Siegel, K. Suhling, D. Davis, J. Lever, D. Phillips, A. Wallace, and P. French. Biomedical applications of fluorescence lifetime imaging. *Optics and Photonics News*, 12(11):26–32, 2002. 2

[19] H. W. Engl, M. Hanke, and A. Neubauer. *Regularization of inverse problems*, volume 375. Springer, 1996. 12

[20] E. Esser, M. Möller, S. Osher, G. Sapiro, and J. Xin. A convex model for nonnegative matrix factorization and dimensionality reduction on physical space. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 21(7):3239–3252, July 2012. 2

[21] M. Fornasier and H. Rauhut. Recovery algorithms for vector valued data withjoint sparsity constraints. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 46(2):577–613, 2008. 1, 3, 36

[22] M. Fortin and R. Glowinski. *Augmented Lagrangian Methods: Applications to the Solution of Boundary-Value Problems*. North-Holland: Amsterdam, 1983. 26

[23] M. Fortin and R. Glowinski. On decomposition-coordination methods using an augmented lagrangian. In *Augmented Lagrangian Methods: Applications to the Solution of Boundary-Value Problems*, chapter 3, pages 97–146. North-Holland: Amsterdam, 1983. 26

[24] J.-J. Fuchs. On sparse representations in arbitrary redundant bases. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 50(6):1341–1344, June 2004. 21

[25] M. Fukushima. Application of the alternating direction method of multipliers to separable convex programming problems. *Computational Optimization and Applications*, 1:93–111, 1992. 26

[26] D. Gabay. Applications of the method of multipliers to variational inequalities. In *Augmented Lagrangian Methods: Applications to the Solution of Boundary-Value Problems*, chapter 9, pages 299–332. North-Holland: Amsterdam, 1983. 26

[27] D. Gabay and B. Mercier. A dual algorithm for the solution of nonlinear variational problems via finite element approximations. *Computers and Mathematics with Applications*, 2:17–40, 1976. 4, 26

[28] R. Glowinski and A. Marrocco. Sur l'approximation, par elements finis d'ordre un, et la resolution, par penalisation-dualité, d'une classe de problems de dirichlet non lineares. *Revue Française d'Automatique, Informatique, et Recherche Opérationelle*, 9:41–76, 1975. 4, 26

[29] R. Glowinski and P. L. Tallec. Augmented lagrangian methods for the solution of variational problems. Technical report, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1987. 26

[30] G. T. Gullberg, B. W. Reutter, A. Sitek, J. S. Maltz, and T. F. Budinger. Dynamic single photon emission computed tomography - basic principles and cardiac applications. *Phys Med Biol.*, 55(20):R111–R191, October 2010. 2

[31] R. N. Gunn, S. R. Gunn, F. E. Turkheimer, J. A. D. Aston, and V. J. Cunningham. Positron emission tomography compartmental models: A basis pursuit strategy for kinetic modeling. *Journal of Cerebral Blood Flow and Metabolism*, 22(12):1425–1439, December 2002. 2

[32] B. S. He, H. Yang, and S. L. Wang. Alternating direction method with self-adaptive penalty parameters for monotone variational inequalities. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 106(2):337–356, 2000. 29

[33] P. Heins. *Reconstruction Using Local Sparsity – A Novel Regularization Technique and an Asymptotic Analysis of Spatial Sparsity Priors.* PhD thesis, Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster, 2014. 36

[34] J. B. Hiriart-Urruty and C. Lemaréchal. *Convex Analysis and Minimization Algorithms I, Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften (Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences), A Series of Comprehensive Studies in Mathematics.* Springer, 1993. 22

[35] G. Huiskamp and F. Greensite. A new method for myocardial activation imaging. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, 44(6):433–446, June 1997. 2

[36] A. Juditsky and A. Nemirovski. On verifiable sufficient conditions for sparse signal recovery via l1-minimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 127(1):57–88, 2011. 1, 21

[37] M. Kowalski. Sparse regression using mixed norms. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 27(3):303–324, November 2009. 1, 26

[38] G.-J. Kremers, E. B. van Munster, J. Goedhart, and T. W. J. Gadella Jr. Quantitative lifetime unmixing of multiexponentially decaying fluorophores using single-frequency fluorescence lifetime imaging microscopy. *Biophysical journal*, 95(1):378–89, July 2008. 2

[39] A. Quattoni, X. Carreras, M. Collins, and T. Darrell. An efficient projection for $\ell_{1,\infty}$ regularization. In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual International Conference on Machine Learning*, ICML '09, pages 857–864, New York, NY, USA, 2009. ACM. 3

[40] B. Rao and K. Kreutz-Delgado. An affine scaling methodology for best basis selection. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 47(1):187–200, 1999. 26

[41] A. J. Reader. Fully 4d image reconstruction by estimation of an input function and spectral coefficients. *IEEE Nuclear Science Symposium Conference Record*, M17-1:3260–3267, 2007. 2, 32

[42] R. T. Rockafellar. Monotone operators and the proximal point algorithm. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 14(5), August 1976. 29

[43] H. Roozen and A. Van Oosterom. Computing the activation sequence at the ventricular heart surface from body surface potentials. *Medical and Biological Engineering and Computing*, 25(3):250–260, 1987. 2

[44] A. Sawatzky. *(Nonlocal) Total Variation in Medical Imaging*. PhD thesis, 2011. 41

[45] M. Schmidt, K. Murphy, G. Fung, and R. Rosales. Structure learning in random fields for heart motion abnormality detection. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision & Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2008. 3

[46] T. Schuster, B. Kaltenbacher, B. Hofmann, and K. S. Kazimierski. *Regularization methods in Banach spaces*, volume 10. Walter de Gruyter, 2012. 12

[47] G. Teschke and R. Ramlau. An iterative algorithm for nonlinear inverse problems with joint sparsity constraints in vector-valued regimes and an application to color image inpainting. *Inverse Problems*, 23:1851–1870, 2007. 1, 3, 36

[48] R. Tibshirani. Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, 58(1):267–288, 1996. 3

[49] R. Tibshirani. Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso: a retrospective. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 73(3):273–282, 2011. 3

[50] A. N. Tikhonov and V. Y. Arsenin. *Solutions of ill-posed problems*. Winston, 1977. 14

[51] J. A. Tropp. Greed is good: Algorithmic results for sparse approximation. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 50:2231–2242, 2004. 1

[52] J. A. Tropp. Algorithms for simultaneous sparse approximation part ii: Convex relaxation. *Signal Processing - Sparse approximations in signal and image processing*, 86(3):589 – 602, March 2006. 1, 10

[53] J. A. Tropp. Just relax: Convex programming methods for identifying sparse signals in noise. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 52(3):1030–1051, March 2006. 21

[54] P. Tseng. Applications of a splitting algorithm to decomposition in convex programming and variational inequalities. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 29:119–138, 1991. 26

[55] J. E. Vogt and V. Roth. The group-lasso: $\ell_{1,\infty}$ regularization versus $\ell_{1,2}$ regularization. In *Pattern Recognition - 32nd DAGM Symposium*, volume 6376, pages 252–261. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2010. 3

[56] S. L. Wang and L. Z. Liao. Decomposition method with a variable parameter for a class of monotone variational inequality problems. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 109(2):415–429, 2001. 29

[57] G. A. Watson. Characterization of the subdifferential of some matrix norms. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 170:33–45, 1992. 1, 10

[58] M. N. Wernick and J. N. Aarsvold, editors. *Emission Tomography: The Fundamentals of PET and SPECT*. San Diego, CA [etc.] : Elsevier Academic Press, 2004. 2, 31, 33

[59] M. Yuan and Y. Lin. Model selection and estimation in regression with grouped variables. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 68(1):49–67, 2006. 3

[60] C.-H. Zhang and T. Zhang. A general framework of dual certificate analysis for structured sparse recovery problems. Technical report, Rutgers University, NJ, Januar 2012. 12

A Exact ℓ^1-Reconstruction of 1-Sparse Signals in 1D

In order to gain some understanding into suitable and necessary scaling conditions recovering locally 1-sparse solutions, we first consider the simplest case, namely $M = 1$, when the problem reduces to standard ℓ^1-minimization:

Theorem 13 (Exact Reconstruction of a 1-sparse Signal in 1D)**.**
Let the vector $w := e_j^T B^T = b_j^T$ be the jth basis vector and let $c = 1 - (\alpha + \beta)$ hold for $(\alpha + \beta) \in (0, 1)$.
If $\hat{u} = ce_j^T$ is the solution of (4), then the matrix B has to meet the scaling condition

$$\|\gamma b_n\|_{\ell^2} = 1 \qquad \textit{and} \qquad |\langle \gamma b_n, \gamma b_m \rangle| \leq 1 \quad \textit{for} \quad n \neq m \,. \tag{25}$$

Proof.
We firstly calculate the optimality condition of (4) as

$$0 = \left(\gamma^2 \left(uB^T - w\right) B\right)_n + (\alpha + \beta)\, p_n \qquad \text{with} \qquad p_n \in \partial |u_n| \,.$$

Then it follows that

$$p_n = \frac{1}{\alpha + \beta} \left(\gamma^2 \left(w - uB^T\right) B\right)_n$$

holds. Subsequently, we insert $\hat{u} = ce_j^T$ and $w = e_j^T B^T$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} p_n &= \frac{1}{\alpha + \beta} \left(\gamma^2 \left(e_j^T B^T - ce_j^T B^T\right) B\right)_n \\ &= \frac{1 - c}{\alpha + \beta} \left(\gamma^2 e_j^T B^T B\right)_n \\ &= \frac{1 - c}{\alpha + \beta} \left(\gamma^2 b_j^T B\right)_n \\ &= \frac{1 - c}{\alpha + \beta} \sum_{k=1}^{T} \gamma_t^2 b_{tj} b_{tn} \\ &= \frac{1 - c}{\alpha + \beta} \langle \gamma b_j, \gamma b_n \rangle \end{aligned}$$

for every $n \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$. Since $p_n \in \partial \, |\hat{u}_n|$ has to be satisfied for all $n \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$, we need to ensure that

$$p_j = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad p_i \in [-1, 1] \quad \text{for} \quad i \neq j$$

hold, which is true under the assumptions mentioned above. □

For this reason we know that we have to normalize our basis vectors with respect to the ℓ^2-norm to reconstruct at least a δ-peak exactly in one dimension. Note that in the one-dimensional case the $\ell^{1,\infty}$-regularization and the $\ell^{1,1}$-regularization reduce to a single ℓ^1-regularization with regularization parameter $\alpha + \beta$.

We further analyze the special case of the *Kullback-Leibler approximation* (cp. [44, pp. 58-59]).

Theorem 14 (Exact Recovery of a δ-Peak in 1D with KL-Approximation)**.**
Let the vector $w := e_j^T B^T = b_j^T$ be the jth basis vector and let $c = 1 - (\alpha + \beta)$ hold for $c \in (0, 1)$.
In case that $\hat{u} = ce_j^T$ is the solution of (4) with $\gamma = \frac{1}{\sqrt{w}}$, then the columns of the matrix B have to be normalized in the ℓ^1-norm, i.e.

$$\|b_n\|_{\ell^1} = 1 \qquad \forall\, n \in \{1, ...N\} \ .$$

Proof.
We first compute the optimality condition of (4) with $\gamma = \frac{1}{\sqrt{w}}$ as

$$0 = \left(\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{w}} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{w}} \left(uB^T - w \right) \right) \right) B \right)_n + (\alpha + \beta)\, p_n \qquad \text{with} \qquad p_n \in \partial \left| u_n \right| \ . \tag{50}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} p_n &= \frac{1}{\alpha + \beta} \left(\left(\frac{1}{w} \left(w - uB^T \right) \right) B \right)_n \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha + \beta} \left(\left(\mathbb{1}_t^T - \frac{1}{w} uB^T \right) B \right)_n \end{aligned}$$

holds. Then we insert $\hat{u}$ and w and conclude

$$\begin{aligned} p_n &= \frac{1}{\alpha + \beta} \left(\left(\mathbb{1}_t^T - \frac{ce_j^T B^T}{e_j^T B^T} \right) B \right)_n \\ &= \frac{1 - c}{\alpha + \beta} \left(\mathbb{1}_t^T B \right)_n \\ &= \frac{1 - c}{\alpha + \beta} \sum_{k=1}^{T} b_{tn} \\ &= \frac{1 - c}{\alpha + \beta} \|b_n\|_{\ell 1} \ . \end{aligned}$$

With the assumptions mentioned above we obtain again $p_n \in \partial \left| \hat{u}_n \right|$. □

It is worth mentioning that in this case every positive solution of $Bu = w$ meets the optimality condition (50), in particular every non-sparse solution.

B Solving the Positive $\ell^{1,\infty} - \ell^{1,1}$-Projection-Problem

We want to solve the following problem

$$\min_{D \in G} \ \frac{\lambda}{2} \left\| D - U + P \right\|_F^2 + \beta \sum_{i=1}^{M} \sum_{j=1}^{N} d_{ij} \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{j=1}^{N} d_{ij} \leq \tilde{v} \ \ \forall\, i \in \{1, \ldots, M\}. \tag{51}$$

In order to do so, we reformulate the first part of the problem, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\lambda}{2}\left\|D-U+P\right\|_F^2+\beta\sum_{i=1}^{M}\sum_{j=1}^{N}d_{ij}\\
=&\sum_{i=1}^{M}\sum_{j=1}^{N}\left(\frac{\lambda}{2}\left(d_{ij}-u_{ij}+p_{ij}\right)^2+\beta d_{ij}\right)\\
=&\sum_{i=1}^{M}\sum_{j=1}^{N}\frac{\lambda}{2}\left(d_{ij}^2-2d_{ij}\left(u_{ij}+p_{ij}\right)+\left(u_{ij}+p_{ij}\right)^2+\frac{2\beta}{\lambda}d_{ij}\right)\\
=&\sum_{i=1}^{M}\sum_{j=1}^{N}\frac{\lambda}{2}\left(d_{ij}^2-2d_{ij}\left(u_{ij}+p_{ij}-\frac{\beta}{\lambda}\right)+\left(u_{ij}+p_{ij}\right)^2\right)\\
=&\sum_{i=1}^{M}\sum_{j=1}^{N}\frac{\lambda}{2}\left(d_{ij}-\left(u_{ij}+p_{ij}-\frac{\beta}{\lambda}\right)\right)^2-\frac{\lambda}{2}\left(\left(u_{ij}+p_{ij}-\frac{\beta}{\lambda}\right)^2+\left(u_{ij}+p_{ij}\right)^2\right)\ .
\end{aligned}$$

Since the last part of the sum is independent of d_{ij}, we can consider

$$\min_{D\in G}\ \frac{\lambda}{2}\left\|D-U+P-\frac{\beta}{\lambda}\mathbb{1}_{M\times N}\right\|_F^2\quad\text{s.t.}\quad\sum_{j=1}^{N}d_{ij}\leq\tilde{v}\ \ \forall\, i\in\{1,\dots,M\}$$

instead. We minimize this with respect to every row independently, i.e.

$$\min_{D\in\mathbb{R}^{M\times N}}\ \frac{\lambda}{2}\left\|d_{(i)}-u_{(i)}+p_{(i)}-\frac{\beta}{\lambda}\mathbb{1}_N\right\|_2^2 \tag{52}$$

where $i\in\{1,\dots,M\}$ holds and with respect to the constraints

$$\left(d_{(i)}\right)_j\geq 0\quad\forall\, j\in\{1,\dots,N\}\ , \tag{Constr1}$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N}\left(d_{(i)}\right)_j\leq\tilde{v}\ , \tag{Constr2}$$

with $d_{(i)}$ denoting the ith *transposed* row of D, for $u_{(i)}$, $p_{(i)}$ respectively.
In order to minimize this problem, we first consider (52) only under (Constr1). In this case the solution is given by

$$\widetilde{d}_{(i)}=\max\left\{u_{(i)}+p_{(i)}-\frac{\beta}{\lambda}\mathbb{1}_N,0\right\}\ . \tag{53}$$

To include (Constr2), we have to do a case-by-case-analysis:

Case a:
Let (53) satisfy (Constr2). In this case the solution of (52) under (Constr1) and (Constr2) is given by

$$d_{(i)}=\widetilde{d}_{(i)}\ .$$

Case b:

Let (53) *not* satisfy (Constr2), i.e. $\sum_{j=1}^{N} \left(\widetilde{d}_{(i)}\right)_j > \tilde{v}$. Then the solution of (52) under (Constr1) and (Constr2) has to fulfill

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N} \left(d_{(i)}\right)_j = \tilde{v} \ . \tag{Constr3}$$

Thus we have to solve (52) under (Constr1) and (Constr3). For this purpose we propose the corresponding Lagrange functional as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^{\lambda}(d_{(i)}, \mu_{(i)}, \vartheta) = \min_{D \in \mathbb{R}^{M \times N}} \ & \frac{\lambda}{2} \left\| d_{(i)} - u_{(i)} + p_{(i)} - \frac{\beta}{\lambda} \mathbb{1}_N \right\|_2^2 \\ & + \vartheta \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N} \left(d_{(i)}\right)_j - \tilde{v} \right) - \sum_{j=1}^{N} \left(d_{(i)}\right)_j \left(\mu_{(i)}\right)_j \ . \end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

Once we know ϑ we can compute the optimal $d_{(i)}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} d_{(i)} &= \text{shrink}^{+} \left(u_{(i)} + p_{(i)} - \frac{\beta}{\lambda} \mathbb{1}_N, \ \frac{\vartheta}{\lambda} \mathbb{1}_N \right) \\ &:= \max \left\{ u_{(i)} + p_{(i)} - \frac{\beta}{\lambda} \mathbb{1}_N - \frac{\vartheta}{\lambda} \mathbb{1}_N, \ 0 \right\} . \end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

We can see this by computing the optimality condition of (54), i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \partial_{d_{(i)}} \mathcal{L}^{\lambda}(d_{(i)}, \mu_{(i)}, \vartheta) \\ &= \lambda \left(d_{(i)} - u_{(i)} + p_{(i)} - \frac{\beta}{\lambda} \mathbb{1}_N \right) + \vartheta \mathbb{1}_N - \mu_{(i)} \ , \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

with the complementary conditions

$$\left(\mu_{(i)}\right)_j \geq 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \left(\mu_{(i)}\right)_j \left(d_{(i)}\right)_j = 0 \ \ \forall j \in \{1, \ldots, N\} \ .$$

If $\left(d_{(i)}\right)_j \neq 0$ holds, then we have $\left(\mu_{(i)}\right)_j = 0$ and thus we obtain from (56) that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \lambda \left(d_{(i)} - u_{(i)} + p_{(i)} - \frac{\beta}{\lambda} \mathbb{1}_N \right) + \vartheta \mathbb{1}_N \\ \Leftrightarrow \ d_{(i)} &= u_{(i)} - p_{(i)} + \frac{\beta - \vartheta}{\lambda} \mathbb{1}_N \end{aligned}$$

has to be true. On the other hand, if $\left(d_{(i)}\right)_j = 0$, then $\left(\mu_{(i)}\right)_j \geq 0$. Hence we see from (56) that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\mu_{(i)}\right)_j &= \lambda \left(p_{(i)} - u_{(i)}\right)_j - \beta + \vartheta \geq 0 \ , \\ \Leftrightarrow \qquad & \left(u_{(i)} - p_{(i)}\right)_j + \frac{\beta - \vartheta}{\lambda} \leq 0 \ . \end{aligned}$$

The Lagrange parameter ϑ should be chosen such that (Constr3) holds. Therefore we investigate

$$\sum_{j \in I} \left(\left(u_{(i)} - p_{(i)}\right)_j + \frac{\beta - \vartheta}{\lambda} \right) = v \ ,$$

with the set I containing all indices, for which

$$\left(u_{(i)} - p_{(i)}\right)_j + \frac{\beta - \vartheta}{\lambda} \geq 0 \tag{57}$$

holds, since for all other indices $j \notin I$ the term $\left(u_{(i)} - p_{(i)}\right)_j + \frac{\beta-\vartheta}{\lambda}$ is projected to 0 due to (55).
Hence we obtain

$$\vartheta = \frac{\lambda}{|I|}\left(\sum_{j\in I}\left(u_{(i)} - p_{(i)}\right)_j + \frac{\beta}{\lambda} - \tilde{v}\right) .$$

Now we have to compute I. Since we are able to sort the vectors according to value, it is sufficient to find $|I|$. Then we obtain

$$\vartheta = \frac{\lambda}{|I|}\left(\sum_{r=1}^{|I|}\left(\widehat{u_{(i)} - p_{(i)}}\right)_r + \frac{\beta}{\lambda} - \tilde{v}\right) ,$$

where $\widehat{\cdot}$ denotes the respective vector sorted according to value.
In order to obtain $|I|$, we use the following

Theorem 15 ([15, p. 3])**.**
Let $\widehat{u_{(i)} - p_{(i)}}$ denote the vector obtained by sorting $u_{(i)} - p_{(i)}$ in a descending order. Then the number of indices, for which (57) *holds, is*

$$|I| = \max\left\{j : \lambda\left(\widehat{u_{(i)} - p_{(i)}}\right)_j + \beta - \frac{\lambda}{j}\left(\sum_{r=1}^{j}\left(\widehat{u_{(i)} - p_{(i)}}\right)_r + \frac{\beta}{\lambda} - \tilde{v}\right) > 0\right\} .$$

Now we are able to propose the solving algorithm.

C Inequality for Stopping Criteria

In order to proof the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2}\left\|AZ - W\right\|_F^2 + \beta\sum_{i=1}^{M}\sum_{j=1}^{N} d_{ij} + J(D) - Y^* \\ \leq\ &\left\langle P^k, R_1^k\right\rangle_F + \left\langle Q^k, R_2^k\right\rangle_F + \left\langle U^k - U^*, S^k\right\rangle_F , \end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

which is needed in Subsection 4.2, we are going to adapt the proof of [5, Appendix A] to the case of our double splitting.

Let us consider the unscaled augmented Lagrangian (33). By definition U^{k+1} minimizes

$$\mathcal{L}_{un}^{\lambda,\mu}\left(U, D^k, Z^k; \widetilde{P}^k, \widetilde{Q}^k\right) ,$$

D^{k+1} minimizes

$$\mathcal{L}_{un}^{\lambda,\mu}\left(U^{k+1}, D, Z^k; \widetilde{P}^k, \widetilde{Q}^k\right)$$

Algorithm 2 Positive $\ell^{1,\infty}$-$\ell^{1,1}$-Projection

Parameters: $U \in \mathbb{R}^{M\times N},\ P \in \mathbb{R}^{M\times N}, \tilde{v} > 0,\ \beta > 0,\ \lambda > 0,\ M, N \in \mathbb{N}$
Initialization: $D \equiv 0,\ |I| = 0,\ \vartheta = 0$
for all $i \in \{1, ..., M\}$ **do**
  $\widetilde{d}_{(i)} = \max\left\{u_{(i)} + p_{(i)} - \frac{\beta}{\lambda}\mathbb{1}_N, 0\right\}$;
  if $\sum_{j=1}^{N} \widetilde{d}_{ij} \leq \tilde{v}$ **then** ▷ Solve with (Constr1) and (Constr2)
    $d_{(i)} = \widetilde{d_{(i)}}$;
  else ▷ Solve with (Constr1) and (Constr3)
    $|I| = \max\left\{j : \lambda\big(\widehat{u_{(i)} - p_{(i)}}\big)_j + \beta - \frac{\lambda}{j}\left(\sum_{r=1}^{j}\big(\widehat{u_{(i)} - p_{(i)}}\big)_r + \frac{\beta}{\lambda} - \tilde{v}\right) > 0\right\}$;
    $\vartheta = \frac{\lambda}{|I|}\left(\sum_{r=1}^{|I|}\big(\widehat{u_{(i)} - p_{(i)}}\big)_r + \frac{\beta}{\lambda} - \tilde{v}\right)$;
    $d_{(i)} = \mathrm{shrink}^{+}\left(u_{(i)} + p_{(i)} - \frac{\beta}{\lambda}\mathbb{1}_N,\ \frac{\vartheta}{\lambda}\mathbb{1}_N\right)$;
  end if
end for
return D ▷ Solution of (51)

and Z^{k+1} minimizes

$$\mathcal{L}_{un}^{\lambda,\mu}\left(U^{k+1}, D^{k+1}, Z; \widetilde{P}^k, \widetilde{Q}^k\right) .$$

We now have to examine the optimality conditions.

OPT1:
By starting with

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\in \partial_U \mathcal{L}_{un}^{\lambda,\mu}\left(U^{k+1}, D^k, Z^k; \widetilde{P}^k, \widetilde{Q}^k\right) \\ &= \widetilde{P}^k + \lambda(U^{k+1} - D^k) + \widetilde{Q}^k B + \mu(U^{k+1}B^T - Z^k)B , \end{aligned}$$

we insert the Lagrange updates

$$\widetilde{P}^k = \widetilde{P}^{k+1} + \lambda(D^{k+1} - U^{k+1}) \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{Q}^k = \widetilde{Q}^{k+1} + \mu(Z^{k+1} - U^{k+1}B^T) \tag{58}$$

and obtain

$$0 \in \widetilde{P}^{k+1} + \widetilde{Q}^{k+1}B + \lambda(D^{k+1} - D^k) + \mu(Z^{k+1} - Z^k)B .$$

Thus we see that U^{k+1} minimizes

$$\left\langle \widetilde{P}^{k+1} + \widetilde{Q}^{k+1}B, U\right\rangle_F + \lambda\left\langle D^{k+1} - D^k, U\right\rangle_F + \mu\left\langle Z^{k+1} - Z^k, UB^T\right\rangle_F .$$

OPT2:

Here we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\in \partial_D \mathcal{L}_{un}^{\lambda,\mu}\left(U^{k+1}, D^{k+1}, Z^k; \widetilde{P}^k, \widetilde{Q}^k\right) \\ &= \beta \mathbb{1}_{M\times N} - \widetilde{P}^k - \lambda(U^{k+1} - D^{k+1}) + \partial J(D^{k+1}) \,, \end{aligned}$$

with J as defined in (39). Inserting $\widetilde{P}^k$ from (58) yields

$$0 \in \beta \mathbb{1}_{M\times N} - \widetilde{P}^{k+1} + \partial J(D^{k+1})$$

and hence we see that D^{k+1} minimizes

$$\beta \sum_{i=1}^{M}\sum_{j=1}^{N} d_{ij} - \left\langle \widetilde{P}^{k+1}, D\right\rangle_F \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{j=1}^{N} d_{ij} \leq \tilde{v},\ d_{ij} \geq 0 \,.$$

OPT3:

In this case we compute

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\in \partial_Z \mathcal{L}_{un}^{\lambda,\mu}\left(U^{k+1}, D^{k+1}, Z^{k+1}; \widetilde{P}^k, \widetilde{Q}^k\right) \\ &= A^T(AZ^{k+1} - W) - \widetilde{Q}^k - \mu(U^{k+1}B^T - Z^{k+1}) \,. \end{aligned}$$

Inserting $\widetilde{Q}^k$ from (58) yields

$$0 \in A^T(AZ^{k+1} - W) - \widetilde{Q}^{k+1} \,.$$

Therefore Z^{k+1} minimizes

$$\frac{1}{2}\left\|AZ - W\right\|_F^2 - \left\langle \widetilde{Q}^{k+1}, Z\right\rangle_F \,.$$

All in all it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\langle \widetilde{P}^{k+1} + \widetilde{Q}^{k+1}B, U^{k+1}\right\rangle_F + \lambda\left\langle D^{k+1} - D^k, U^{k+1}\right\rangle_F + \mu\left\langle Z^{k+1} - Z^k, U^{k+1}B^T\right\rangle_F \\ \leq\ &\left\langle \widetilde{P}^{k+1} + \widetilde{Q}^{k+1}B, U^*\right\rangle_F + \lambda\left\langle D^{k+1} - D^k, U^*\right\rangle_F + \mu\left\langle Z^{k+1} - Z^k, U^*B^T\right\rangle_F \end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

and

$$\beta \sum_{i=1}^{M}\sum_{j=1}^{N} d_{ij}^{k+1} - \left\langle \widetilde{P}^{k+1}, D^{k+1}\right\rangle_F + J(D^{k+1}) \ \leq\ \beta \sum_{i=1}^{M}\sum_{j=1}^{N} d_{ij}^{*} - \left\langle \widetilde{P}^{k+1}, D^{*}\right\rangle_F + J(D^{*}) \tag{60}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2}\left\|AZ^{k+1} - W\right\|_F^2 - \left\langle \widetilde{Q}^{k+1}, Z^{k+1}\right\rangle_F \ \leq\ \frac{1}{2}\left\|AZ^{*} - W\right\|_F^2 - \left\langle \widetilde{Q}^{k+1}, Z^{*}\right\rangle_F \tag{61}$$

have to hold. Adding equations (59), (60) and (61) together leads to

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2}\left\|AZ^{k+1} - W\right\|_F^2 + \beta \sum_{i=1}^{M}\sum_{j=1}^{N} d_{ij}^{k+1} + J(D^{k+1}) - \frac{1}{2}\left\|AZ^{*} - W\right\|_F^2 - \beta \sum_{i=1}^{M}\sum_{j=1}^{N} d_{ij}^{*} - J(D^{*}) \\ \leq\ &\left\langle \widetilde{P}^{k+1}, D^{k+1} - U^{k+1}\right\rangle_F + \left\langle \widetilde{Q}^{k+1}, Z^{k+1} - U^{k+1}B^T\right\rangle_F + \lambda\left\langle D^{k+1} - D^k, U^* - U^{k+1}\right\rangle_F \\ &+ \mu\left\langle Z^{k+1} - Z^k, (U^* - U^{k+1})B^T\right\rangle_F + \left\langle \widetilde{P}^{k+1}, U^* - D^*\right\rangle_F + \left\langle \widetilde{Q}^{k+1}, U^*B^T - Z^*\right\rangle_F \end{aligned}$$

By using the definitions of $R_{1,2}^{k+1}$ and S^{k+1} (see for instance (41),(42) and (40)) and the fact that we have $U^* = D^*$ and $U^*B^T = Z^*$, we finally obtain

$$\frac{1}{2}\left\|AZ^{k+1} - W\right\|_F^2 + \beta \sum_{i=1}^{M}\sum_{j=1}^{N} d_{ij}^{k+1} + J(D^{k+1}) - Y^* \leq \left\langle P, R_1^k\right\rangle_F + \left\langle Q, R_2^k\right\rangle_F + \left\langle S^k, U^k - U^*\right\rangle_F \,.$$